



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2013

No. 140

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 9, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

LEAVING THIS WORLD A LITTLE BETTER THAN YOU FOUND IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, "Try and leave this world a little better than you found it." Those were the parting words of Robert Baden Powell, a soldier, writer, and founder of the world scouting movement. This was a message to all Scouts that was found among his papers after Powell's passing in 1941.

I am a scouter, Mr. Speaker. It is part of who I am, both as an American

and an elected official proudly representing Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. Scouter Powell's words today are part of scouting's principles, to always leave the campsite cleaner than when you found it. It is into service, serving others, and making the world a better place. They also ring true in the debate taking place now in Washington.

Today we are saddling future generations with mountains of debt. We have made promises we cannot keep. We are leaving the next generation worse off than our own. We face a Nation with grave challenges, challenges that aren't being addressed. The fact of the matter is that Congress has yet to deal with the real drivers of our debt, a large portion of which is health care costs.

Mr. Speaker, I don't care who won the White House or which party holds the majority in Congress. Why? Because not until we actually tackle the tough issues, the tough challenges, can we honestly say that Congress or the White House is doing what is right for the country. Right now we aren't making necessary progress, not on our budget and deficits, not on our long-term debt, not on bringing down the cost of health care. Though we have made some progress on spending, we are nowhere near where we need to be.

We are also leaving the health system worse than where we found it. Here are just two letters from my constituents that my office has received.

Tina, from Jefferson County, Pennsylvania, writes:

Please do not vote in any way to continue funding the Affordable Care Act. It in no way improves the situation of the average American. Yes, it provides another option for health insurance, but the rates are no more affordable than the private insurances; and therefore, if a person cannot afford the private insurance, there is no way they will be able to afford the government plan. In addition, the act places further strain on the system and will cause the shutdown of more

hospitals, cause more physicians to leave the system, and further crowd our Nation's emergency departments.

Catherine from DuBois wrote:

I am fortunate to have good insurance through my employer. However, I found out from them that they may provide a lesser form of health care due to the no-Cadillac plan. They understandably want to avoid a penalty for providing a good plan. This seems unfair to me, as if we are being penalized for working and having a good employer. If they are willing to provide a good health plan, why should they be penalized and why should they have to lessen our coverage? I am very distraught about many layers of the health care plan that are starting to come to light. I don't know if anything can be done.

I cannot stand idle as Congress acts like it is solving problems when, in fact, it is failing to tackle the tough issues, health being one of them. Let me be clear that a government shutdown is unacceptable. However, each day we stall and fail to deal with these challenges, the worse it gets for the next generation.

The real debate needs to be about how we get our fiscal house in order and set a course of long-term job growth. Not until then will I be satisfied. It should be about addressing the challenges the people elected us to solve. Again, not until then will I be satisfied. It is about trying to "leave this world a little better than you found it."

GETTING TO A BIG DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker said that the shutdown should be unacceptable. I agree with that. We could all, within the next half an hour, vote to make the unacceptable not the policy that we are pursuing.

Mr. Speaker, our government has now been shut down for over a week

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6415

and the American people are looking to Congress for solutions, not spin. Thousands of dedicated Federal employees here, but more profusely around this country, continue to be furloughed without pay, all because a faction of Republicans insist on keeping government closed until we repeal the Affordable Care Act, a demand that has nothing to do with keeping our government open.

Debate about the Affordable Care Act is legitimate. There are people who disagree with it and people who agree with it. But holding ransom the people's government is and should be, as the previous speaker said, unacceptable.

Americans are tired, I am tired, I think most Members are tired of hearing the same rhetoric from politicians over and over. Instead, they want real solutions that can restore fiscal sanity, end the irrational sequester which HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a conservative Republican from Kentucky, says does not work and cannot work, and break the cycle of manufactured crises that do nothing to help our economy and, in fact, are doing it great harm. So the question, Mr. Speaker, we must ask ourselves is: How do we reach a solution? How can this Congress achieve the big, balanced deal that our constituents expect from us?

First and foremost we must end the shutdown. Mr. Speaker, 200 Democrats—we have a vacancy—200 Democrats will vote this very day, this very hour, to open the government. That means, Mr. Speaker, we only need 18 Republicans. The previous speaker said it is unacceptable where we are. We can change it, and we can change it within the hour, with only 18 Republicans joining 200 Democrats to say let the people's government be open; let the people's government be serving them.

First and foremost, Mr. Speaker, we must end this shutdown and take action to prevent the United States from defaulting on its bills for the first time in history. A solvent nation should not be taken hostage to accomplish an objective. Once these immediate threats are removed, Congress should then vote to go to conference on the differences which are legitimate between our two budgets. Republicans have refused, for the last six months in the House and in the Senate, to go to conference.

The Speaker talks about negotiation. That is where you do it. That is the mechanism that is set up under our democracy to resolve differences. Go to conference. There we can have the opportunity to agree on a comprehensive, balanced plan to put our country on a fiscally sustainable path, not for the next week, the next month, the next 180 days, but for decades to come; and if we do that, our economy will explode, jobs will be created, and Americans will again feel good, not only about their country, but about their Congress.

The shutdown and the threat of default are standing in the way of a real

negotiation process for a long-term solution. Democrats, I say, Mr. Speaker, are ready to sit down and talk with our Republican colleagues about a long-term agreement. We know that will require tough decisions, but Republicans should not demand their own policies as ransom required to reopen the government and make sure America pays its bills.

Democrats have already made the difficult choice to accept the Republican's preferred budget level for the short-term funding bill. How do I know it is their preferred funding bill? Because they voted on it and sent it to the Senate, Mr. Speaker, and the Senate said, We will accept your number, and they sent it back here; and my Republican colleagues will not say "yes" to their own number.

A big and balanced agreement on a budget. After we take the Republican number to open up government, go to conference, have discussions, a big and balanced agreement on the budget and on getting our debt under control will require real compromise and difficult decisions. My colleagues, we should have the wisdom and, yes, the courage to make them; and if we do, future generations will thank us.

I continue to believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a bipartisan majority of Members in this House who are ready to work in good faith towards achieving such an agreement. My observation, however, is, after 33 years in this body, that there is a small faction on the Republican side of the aisle—it may be 50, it may be 60—that is holding captive the 170 of their colleagues who want to make sense and move forward.

I hope that Speaker BOEHNER will take the important steps necessary to enable those negotiations to begin by allowing a vote on the Senate's bill at the House number to reopen government and another one on a clean measure to prevent an unthinkable and economically catastrophic default. Once those occur, Mr. Speaker, we will be able to resume work on achieving real and lasting results for the American people when it comes to our long-term fiscal health.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, would bring the bill to open our government, the people's government, to the floor this day.

THREE CRISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, this October fiscal crisis is punctuated by three developments that are becoming increasingly obvious and disturbing. The first is the refusal of the Senate and the President to resolve their differences with the House through negotiation and compromise on the bill that would actually fund the government and end this shutdown. In recent

days, senior administration officials have said they don't care how long the shutdown lasts because they are winning politically and the President would rather the Nation default than negotiate with the House.

Our form of government cannot operate in such a manner. Congress is a bicameral legislature. That means two Houses that are specifically designed to have a different perspective on issues. The two Houses of Congress were designed to disagree. The only way a bicameral legislature can possibly function is through each House exercising its own best judgment on a given issue and then coming together and meeting to isolate their differences and resolve them through negotiation and compromise.

The conference process of Congress has evolved over centuries. It is very effective at resolving the differences between the two Houses; but it takes two Houses to operate it, and the Senate is refusing to do so. This malfunction is at the very heart of our stalemate.

The second development is the deliberate decision by the administration to amplify the public's suffering and inconvenience during this stalemate. This government has gone through 18 shutdowns now in the past 37 years, but never has a President barricaded open-air venues like national memorials. In fact, he has gone so far as to forbid the use of turnouts on public roads that offer passersby distant views of Mt. Rushmore and Yosemite. He has ordered people out of their own homes and ordered businesses to close just because they lease land from the Federal Government. He has even tried to close the Atlantic Ocean to Florida fishermen.

In the past, Presidents have done everything they could to minimize the impacts of shutdowns. This President is going to ridiculous extremes to maximize the suffering that people must endure. One park ranger told a reporter, "We've been told to make life as difficult for people as we can." And then he added, "It's disgusting." And when this House has passed stopgap measures to minimize these impacts, the President and the Senate have summarily rejected them.

The third development is the rapid unraveling of ObamaCare. As it has rolled out, millions of Americans have discovered that their health insurance rates have skyrocketed or they are losing their health plans entirely or that they are having their hours cut back at work. It is very clear that the public isn't buying these new government-brokered policies. One hundred and seventy thousand people visited the Maryland exchange looking for affordable insurance since it opened more than a week ago, but only 326 have actually bought these plans, less than 0.2 percent.

Now, imagine, you have got the biggest store in town. People are required by law to purchase your product. You

open for business, and 99.8 percent of the customers who walk into your store walk out again without buying your product. Do you think you have a problem? We can't pretend this isn't happening. Millions of Americans right now are losing their health plans and not finding affordable replacements. This matter must be resolved, and it must be resolved now.

This government only exists with the consent of the governed. When it deliberately goes out of its way to maximize the pain and suffering of the American people in this crisis, it jeopardizes that consent. This matter must be resolved, and it must be resolved now. And this government is simply not designed to function with one party refusing to talk to the other, with one House refusing to resolve the differences that divide it from the other. This simple failure is at the heart of our Nation's distress, and it, too, must be resolved, and it must be resolved now.

We are now 5 years into this administration. They have not been happy ones for our Nation. But now we have arrived at a crisis—or more precisely, at three crises: one that is costing millions of Americans the health plans they liked and were told they could keep, a second in the relationship of this government to the people, and a third in the basic function of our fundamental institutions.

Happily, the Constitution's Framers gave us all of the tools that are necessary to resolve these crises except for one, and that one is what Lincoln called the better angels of our nature. Only we can appeal to those angels, and we must do so before more harm befalls our country.

HOUSE GYM REMAINS OPEN FOR MEMBERS DURING SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today is the ninth day of the Republican shutdown, what started as a tantrum against the Affordable Care Act to defund it, then morphed into a demand to delay it for a year, but now is really an open assault on our system of government.

Unless a fanatic minority holding JOHN BOEHNER and the American people hostage get their way, they will continue to inflict unnecessary pain on hundreds of thousands of our employees and on the American public. Now they are poised to wreck the global economy by threatening that America will not pay its bills. If it works, they will do it all over again.

Make no mistake, this is an assault on our system of government unlike anything we have seen before. We must stop them now, united in the belief that there are some lines we are not going to cross. There will be no weapons on the floor of the House and no willful damage to the American people.

What if these fanatics had their tactics used against them? What if Democrats and Speaker PELOSI demanded that the disastrous war in Iraq stop and, if it didn't, we would wreck the American economy? that our deeply felt concerns about preparing for climate change and global warming were nonnegotiable? What if Senator CHRIS MURPHY, who had 26 innocent children and their teachers massacred in his district, what if he said, Enough. Unless we get background checks for purchasers of guns to make sure that unfit people can't get them, something that 90 percent of the American people agree with, unless I get that, I am going to shut down the government? Can you imagine the howls of outrage?

There is a tremendous disconnect here. One glaring symbol of the disconnect can be found in the sub-basement of the Rayburn office building, the House gym. Now, make no mistake, everywhere I have worked I have started fitness programs for our employees. They save money; they improve productivity; they can even save lives. I helped start a fitness program for our employees here on Capitol Hill. If anything, it may be more important for people in Congress who are leading a crazy, unhealthy lifestyle and can seldom get together and interact like human beings. For 17 years, this is where I have tried to start every single day, to exercise, to enjoy bipartisan camaraderie, an island in the storm of Capitol Hill. It is convenient to be able to shower there instead of at home. It is important. It is very important, but it is not essential.

I had somebody argue with me yesterday that it doesn't cost that much because we pay dues. We have an access key that lets us in and there aren't any staff members there now. Well, that is true. It doesn't cost very much, but it costs. The electricity, the hot water, the towels, they are not provided by gym fairies. They are provided by taxpayers. And the same is true for countless facilities across America, closed by the senseless Republican shutdown.

In fact, since we have decided that we are going to pay all the employees when it is over, we are paying them not to work. And it is costly not to collect fees. You can make a better argument for restoring those services than you can for the House gym. Some of the most fanatic about inflicting unnecessary pain on the American public are regulars, enjoying our House gym while the staff gym is closed.

Mr. Speaker, if you and the House Republicans are serious and not cynical about the shutdown, then shut down the House gym until this madness ends.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS PASSING BILLS TO REOPEN GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, like myself and many Americans, I am very frus-

trated over the inaction of Congress to get its work done; but let's look back at what has happened over the last week or so.

The House Republicans, we have sent bills over to the Democratically-controlled Senate to open the government, to run the government, to fund the government. We have sent, starting from delaying ObamaCare, which most Americans have serious problems with, to other bills, and I want to talk about the latter two that we sent.

One was to fund the government completely until December 15, but also with two exceptions. The one exception is that Members of Congress and the President would live by the same rules under ObamaCare that all Americans have to. The other exception is ObamaCare. We need to delay those rules, and let's move on.

The people that talk about the status quo in American history here, the status quo, if you vote for a clean CR, you want the status quo to remain the same. That means unemployment stays where it is, forcing Americans into part-time work. We need structural changes to the underlying problems. We need to address why our debt keeps going up.

The President, yesterday, in his news conference, talked about raising the debt ceiling doesn't increase the debt ceiling, doesn't increase spending. Well, I wish the President would answer to me: When he took office, the debt was \$10 trillion; now it is approaching \$17 trillion. How does raising the debt ceiling not increase the debt?

The President talks about it is unprecedented, talking about the debt ceiling and having negotiations would be unprecedented if we do that. Well, Ronald Reagan and Speaker Tip O'Neill did it. Bill Clinton did it. President Obama did it in 2011 under the Budget Control Act. It is not unprecedented. And, interestingly, the time the President has been forced to negotiate are times when we have had crises that we have had to address, and the President did that in 2011.

If ObamaCare is so good and it is the President's signature piece of legislation, he ought to be the first one to sign up for it. I believe the First Family ought to be the first in line to sign up for ObamaCare. But, you know what? The President of the United States is exempt from ObamaCare. It doesn't make sense. He ought to have to live by his own bills that he supported and pressed through.

We talk about compromise. I am sure the President doesn't watch FOX News, but I think Bill O'Reilly has a compromise that maybe makes some sense. The individual mandate—that was one of the things we put in there, in one of those bills—we said delay the individual mandate for 1 year. The President delayed the employer mandate for 1 year. It only makes sense, especially when you see so many people having trouble signing up, getting on and all the uncertainty. We are getting reports

now of premiums going through the roof, higher deductibles, higher copays, and we need to delay it.

One of the items we said in the bill was to delay the individual mandate for 1 year. That was rejected by the Senate. Also, we sent a bill over there to say, Okay, if you don't take that, let's just go to conference. Let's sit down and talk. Let's negotiate.

But I think the compromise Bill O'Reilly put out on FOX News the other night makes some sense. Make the individual mandate voluntary, but don't force people to go on this. Delay it for 1 year. Don't force people to go on this and risk their privacy concerns, force them to pay higher insurance premiums for insurance they may not need. Let's see what happens.

As ObamaCare moves through, I think that is a compromise that makes some sense, and the President ought to look at that and talk about that; but in order to do that, he needs to come to the table. He needs to sit down with House Republicans and negotiate and work through the problems. That is how our system of government was set up, and that is how it is supposed to work. The Founders had that right, especially in divided government. So I encourage the President.

Now, this morning there are some reports that the President is inviting the House and Senate Democrats to the White House later today, and supposedly we are going to get an invitation here soon. That is encouraging. I hope he is serious about sitting down and working out the differences, because we have to get back to the work the American people expect us to do.

So I look forward to sitting down with the President and our leadership and working through these problems and getting the government going; but we can't do it without sitting down and talking and making sense and representing the American people, because we were elected to do that.

CREATING JOBS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 1,000 days since I arrived in Congress, and Republican leaders have still not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our jobs crisis. Instead, this House has voted 46 times to defund or delay health care for people who desperately need it, wasting precious time.

Wake up, Republicans. ObamaCare is not only the law of the land; it is not only a safeguard to save the millions of people with preexisting conditions; it is an essential tool to give people the economic security and purchasing power they need to revive our economy.

People need ObamaCare. President Obama cares about the American people, and we should, too. Even a Tea Party member of my freshman class of 2010 understood this when he stood and

expressed his hopes of being able to receive federally subsidized health coverage immediately upon taking office. He was incensed. He couldn't wait 30 days, but he acts as if he wants his constituents to wait forever.

People all over the world are amazed that we do not have universal health care like they do. We are a world power, and they are saying, You don't have universal health care in America?

Mr. Speaker, people want health care; people deserve health care; and, Mr. Speaker, people want jobs. No one wants to revive the Great Recession by playing dangerous games with our economy. But do you know what? That is precisely what this House is doing.

This is scary. I am nervous. I am stunned by the insensitivity. The whole world economy rests on America's Treasury bonds. Let me repeat: The whole world economy rests on America's Treasury bonds.

Mr. Speaker, when we play with fire on the debt ceiling, you threaten to burn down the buttress on which Americans' 401(k)s, mutual funds, small businesses, and stock portfolios rest. Just consider what happened the last time Republicans simply threatened to breach the debt ceiling in 2011. Government bonds were downgraded, retirement assets plummeted, and homeowners saw big hikes in their monthly payments. That was just for talking about breaching the debt ceiling.

Independent analysts have concluded that a debt default would be as bad as the global financial crisis of 2008. After that crisis, American savers lost decades' worth of wealth in their homes and 401(k)s. We are still living with massive unemployment from that crisis to this date.

While some Members of Congress may like to behave as though we have moved past our unemployment crisis, it is a different story when you look at African Americans—13 percent unemployment; the Hispanic community, 9.3 percent unemployment; and the youngest workers, 22 percent unemployment.

Across America there are nearly 12 million people officially out of work and tens of millions more who are underemployed or who have simply given up looking. America's public sector workers—our teachers, firefighters, construction workers, public health workers, medical researchers, public defenders, bus drivers, social workers, and police—have already suffered so painfully, first under the sequester, and now under the shutdown.

But a default would devastate every worker and every retiree. It would hit every 401(k), every mutual fund, every stock portfolio, every mortgage payment, every student loan, and every business loan. It is impossible to be fiscally conservatively or probusiness and simultaneously try to use this financial weapon of mass destruction against American businesses and American taxpayers. It is time for Congress to pass a clean debt ceiling bill.

Mr. Speaker, open the government. Mr. Speaker, raise the debt ceiling. Mr.

Speaker, let's begin to address our real crisis: jobs, jobs, jobs.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to both sides in this very important debate: the future of America and where we are going and how we are going to pay for the future of this country. What is amazing to me is that President Karzai of Afghanistan, I don't believe he has furloughed one person.

We are furloughing U.S. Government workers all across this Nation, but Mr. Karzai continues to get his millions and millions of dollars. Mr. Speaker, this is unnecessary. I don't know why we in Congress continue to fund a war where we can't even get an accountability from the inspectors. It makes no sense.

I want to read three paragraphs from an article I read this weekend, called, "The Forgotten War." One of the paragraphs:

But even when the war "ends" and Americans have forgotten it altogether, it won't be over in Afghanistan. Obama and Karzai continue negotiating towards a bilateral strategic agreement to allow the United States to keep at least nine of the biggest bases it built and several thousand trainers, and undoubtedly Special Operations Forces in Afghanistan, seemingly forever.

Another of the paragraphs:

It won't be over in the United States either. For American soldiers who took part in it and returned with catastrophic physical and mental injuries and for their families, the battles are just beginning. For American taxpayers, the war will continue at least until mid-century. Think of all the families of the dead soldiers to be compensated for their losses, all the wounded with their health care bills, all the brain-damaged veterans at the VA hospitals. Think of the outgoing costs of their drugs and prosthetics and benefits. Medical and disability costs alone are projected to reach \$754 billion, not to mention the hefty retirement pay of all those generals who issued all those reports of progress as they so ambitiously fought more than one war leading nowhere.

Mr. Speaker, just this past weekend, we had five Americans brought back in flag-draped coffins. I doubt sincerely if many people in this country read that report, that five Americans came back in a flag-draped coffin.

I do not understand why this Congress continues to have these difficulties of trying to fix our own problems in this country, but don't worry about the waste, fraud, and abuse—and, more important, the loss of limb and body and heart that our kids have been giving in Afghanistan.

I will close by reading one more paragraph from the article, called, "The Forgotten War":

Will the United States still be meddling in Afghanistan 30 years from now? If history is any guide, the answer is "yes"; and if history is any guide, three decades from now, most

Americans will have only the haziest idea why.

I can only say to the families of those five patriots who came back in a flag-draped coffin, may we never forget. May we never forget that the war in Afghanistan continues to go on and on and probably will for the next 30 years. Come on, Congress, let's get together. Let's stop spending money in Afghanistan. More important, let's stop sending our young men and women to give their limbs and their life.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, as I always do, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I ask God, in His loving arms, to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I ask God to bless us in the House and Senate, bless the President, and, please, God, three times, God, please, God, please, God, please, continue to bless America.

PROVIDING RELIEF FOR AMERICANS AFFECTED BY SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again speak out about the human consequences and the reckless and irresponsible government shutdown. Today it is day 9 into this needless swirl of frustration and madness.

Yesterday I spent time on the telephone talking with a woman whom I am here to represent. She lives in a small town called Roseville, Illinois. It is in the southern part of my congressional district. Her name is Sherri Leath.

Sherri is a decades-long employee of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and she serves as a food inspector. She spent the first 4 years of her employment in a slaughterhouse, a beef slaughterhouse. The last 6 years, she is in the inspection area of a poultry and a pork processing plant. This is not a glamorous job, she is the first to admit that, but she works very hard every day, and she takes great pride in the fact that she is making sure that our food is safe and wholesome.

She has four children and six grandchildren, and she says she keeps them in mind and she keeps all the children in mind throughout this country as she is inspecting in these plants and makes sure, again, that this meat goes out safe and wholesome.

So today she will drive. She has a very long commute. She will spend most of that time in a cooler that is at most 45 degrees. And I would call someone like Sherri Leath an unsung hero, because without people like Sherri, who, again, are not receiving their pay right now, our food supply would be in jeopardy.

So she is going into work every day, not taking home a paycheck, and she is

worried at a deep level about her family's future. She has a husband named Thomas, who is a school bus driver and brings home \$800 a month. This is not enough for Sherri and Thomas Leath to pay their bills.

So they have already discussed what this government shutdown means to their family. Step one for them, if the paycheck doesn't come, is they will tap into their reserves, into their savings. Step two, if it leads to that, they will have to go into further credit card debt. This is not what we should be doing to people like Sherri and Thomas Leath. This is not what we should be doing to the hardworking Federal employees who want nothing more than to do a good job, go to work, and receive fair pay. But this is the way it has been for 9 days now.

We heard Congressman STENY HOYER speak half an hour ago now, talking about that we have an answer to this right now. We have enough Republican votes and we have enough Democratic votes today, within the hour, as he explained it, to get the government up and running again. We could immediately—immediately, today—provide relief for people like Sherri and Thomas Leath by reopening the government right here and right now. We have a bipartisan path to do that.

I would say let's do it. Let's get at it today and put these good, hardworking people back to work and receiving fair pay.

THE INCONVENIENT INCONSISTENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATION—DEBT LIMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker:

The fact that we are here today to debate raising America's debt limit is a sign of leadership failure. It is a sign that the United States Government cannot pay its debts. It is a sign that we now depend on ongoing financial assistance from foreign countries to finance our government's reckless fiscal policies.

That was a statement by Senator Barack Obama in 2006.

Driving up our national debt from \$5 trillion to \$9 trillion is irresponsible. It is unpatriotic.

Once again, Senator Barack Obama in 2008:

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices on to the backs of our children and our grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better. I, therefore intend to oppose the effort to increase America's debt limit.

Senator Barack Obama, 2006.

But that was then; this is now. The President, last week, said, without an increase in the borrowing limit, "the

whole world will have problems." In other words, we are all going to die. The sky is going to fall unless the United States raises the debt limit.

He seems to be a little bit inconsistent on positions regarding the debt limit. Of course, now the debt limit is up to \$17 trillion, double what he talked about several years ago of not raising.

So we find ourselves in a situation where the President's attitude seems to be: I will not negotiate, except with the Russians, the Syrians, the Iranians about what is going on overseas. But I will not negotiate, I will not talk to the House of Representatives about American issues.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that things that are happening in the United States are really just as important as what is happening in Russia, Syria, and Iran—but maybe not to the administration.

The administration would rather be in shutdown and lockdown for political reasons than to talk, to negotiate, to compromise, to even listen.

You know, Mr. Speaker, they say that Nero fiddled while Rome burned. It seems that the administration is in bunker mentality while the United States is in economic turmoil. And where are we? We are in a situation where there is no talking. And it seems to me, the administration says it is our fault. The President won't talk to us. The President has the habit, it seems, to blame others on bad things that happen and takes credit for things that are always good.

But, in any event, I reemphasize the President's own words about why we should not raise the debt limit: it is reckless; it is irresponsible; it is unpatriotic; it hurts us domestically and internationally; it is a failure of leadership, and Americans deserve better.

I agree with that.

So since the President seems to be somewhat inconsistent about his positions, why doesn't he just talk to us? Talk to us about the debt limit, the continuing resolution, about America's issues, America's policies, America's problems, and at least acknowledge that the House of Representatives exists.

So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, when you get to talk to the President—because I don't get to talk to him—and suggest that he come out of the White House and meet with the people's House and quit fiddling around and start talking to us so we can solve this problem together.

And that's just the way it is.

ECONOMIC HARM OF THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the majority party's latest idea is to create a supercommittee to figure out how to reverse their Republican shutdown of

government. Frankly, Congress doesn't need another committee. It only needs the Speaker to unlock the Tea Party chains put on regular committee order and their function in this House. Let the Appropriations Committee do its job as mandated by our Constitution. It can and will get the job done.

Though it is not my first preference, we can begin by allowing a vote on a clean continuing resolution, that is, allowing the Senate bill which contains the Republican budget mark of \$986 billion to move forward. Though the Democrats have expressed deep dismay at that number as it is not what Democrats had sought in discretionary accounts, it speaks loudly to which party is willing to compromise. And then if the majority party does not like the Affordable Care Act, use your real power in the regular committee structure that you control to change it. But closing down the entire government is a sledgehammer when what you need is merely a needle and thread.

Meanwhile, the Republican shutdown is wreaking havoc on our economy. More and more working Americans and businesses are getting singed. How can this be good? The Republican shutdown costs the American people \$12.5 million each hour and \$300 million a day. As of today, the GOP shutdown has already cost the American taxpayers over \$2 billion. Is that responsible government?

The Republican shutdown has caused rising uncertainty about our economy. It has already placed a downdraft on our economic markets and job creation. Yesterday the Dow Jones Industrial Average fell another 160 points. This is part of a recent precipitous slide which has seen the financial market lose nearly 400 points this month alone. Overall, the trend is strongly in the wrong direction—down.

The International Monetary Fund, as a result of the Republican shutdown, cut its growth forecast for our economy by 0.3 percentage points to 2.9 percent for this year and 3.6 percent for next year. This surely will cost the American economy more jobs going forward.

The sapping of U.S. growth will be felt globally, as U.S. economic sluggishness impacts other nations. Global markets continue to fall as well, wondering what will happen to the value of our Treasury bonds. Chaos and uncertainty trigger poor markets. We sure don't need any more of that medicine.

There are over 800,000 Federal workers who have been furloughed as a direct result of the shutdown. They are worrying about whether they can pay their bills, pay their mortgage. NASA, for example, had to furlough 97 percent of its more than 18,000-person workforce due to the closing of the government.

At NASA's Johnson Space Center in Houston, only 100 of 3,150 civil servants have not been furloughed. An additional 10,000 contractors with the Johnson Space Center will face being furloughed.

According to a local FOX affiliate, the NASA Glenn Research Center in Brook Park, Ohio, near Cleveland, which I represent, has essentially furloughed nearly all its 3,000 employees at NASA's key propulsion center. This absolutely punches down the local economy as well as the national.

The Republican shutdown has also caused many more contractors who do detailed work for our government to lose their jobs. Defense contractors like Boeing and Lockheed Martin have had to furlough thousands of employees because the shutdown has halted awards and payments to those companies.

The Republican shutdown hurts government agencies and weakens our national security. There are currently no death benefits given to families of soldiers killed in action; medical treatment for those in the military has been scaled back; and furloughs are creating backlogs for VA disability claims.

Mr. Speaker, just bring the clean continuing resolution that has the Republican budget number in it to a vote. Reopen our government. Use the regular committees to work out any difficulties you have with the Affordable Care Act. And, please, put America's economy back on an even keel.

LIVING WITHIN OUR MEANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, words are very powerful and words are important. I hear the words from our President and realize that he understands the importance of words, also. In the past, he has talked about debt, borrowing, and spending, but now he talks about obligations, because he understands that "debt," to the American public, is a four-letter word. He doesn't want to be tagged with the fact that he is asking for more debt, so now it is "obligations." That is a word that has cleaned up the concept that we are simply borrowing against our future.

But even the word "borrowing" needs to be looked at, because that assumes that we have the credit to borrow with; and the truth is no nation can lend us the kind of deficits that we are running right now, so we are actually printing the money.

But even the word "printing" has been changed in Washington. Now it is "quantitative easing." It just sounds so much better. "Printing" sounds so crass to the American public who might be worried about what is happening to their savings accounts while Washington is printing money.

The word "negotiation" is a word that the President is familiar with. He did it 2 years ago when we reached this exact same point. Both sides came to the table and negotiated, and we wound up with a budget that was not as extremely overdrawn as we had faced before. That is the power of negotiation.

But now the word "negotiation" is taken out of the President's vocabulary, and he declares that he is being held hostage. Oh, really? This thing he calls being held hostage is actually the American way. It is what our Founding Fathers wanted. They came here and set up a system with a President and two Houses of Congress and two different parties; and those parties would sometimes have all the power, and sometimes they would share the power.

This President says he is being held hostage by the system. That means he doesn't believe in the balance of powers that the electorate cast in the last election. He declares over and over that the election is done—I was elected. The same people that elected him chose to put Republicans in power in the House of Representatives. I think they did that because they were afraid of this debt, deficit, borrowing, and spending.

We are told that we should have a clean CR. There is nothing clean about sacrificing the future of our children and grandchildren. That is what the President wants: a CR where he can spend what he wants to spend without negotiations on anything. We actually, in the House, submitted four different plans before this shutdown occurred. Those plans were just summarily rejected by the Senate, waved off, not really even considered; and yet we find our friends declaring this to be the Republican shutdown, not that both Houses failed to come to an agreement and the White House failed to sit down and negotiate. They just weren't going to be held hostage. So now, then, we need a clean CR, according to some, and we need to stop this Republican shutdown.

Words are very powerful. No longer do we talk about spending in Washington. We talk about investing. We are investing the American public's money. We are investing it in things like studies of the sexual habits of the fruit fly in Tijuana or wherever. "Debt" is, indeed, a four-letter word.

We are finally led to believe that default will occur immediately, that we somehow won't pay our obligations, that the American people need to understand that they are still paying their taxes every day and those taxes come to Washington. That is about \$2.5 trillion a year. If we do not extend the debt ceiling any higher, then what Washington is going to have to do is it is going to have to prioritize. It is going to decide which of its expenses to pay.

The Constitution demands that we pay our obligations. It says we can't default on those. Washington would have to do the same thing every American family does: it will have to prioritize its expenses if we do not extend the debt ceiling so chaos will not reign. We simply have to live within our means. That is what every American family has to do.

INVESTING IN AMERICA'S PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me, first of all, say good morning to my colleagues and start with a thank-you to President Obama for his invitation to the White House to all Members of Congress in quite a contrast to the representation of the President's lack of involvement.

In fact, over the last 4 or 5 years, this Congress has failed to pass a budget with a Republican majority in the House. That has constantly raised the question of how can we start growth in America.

So I thank the President, first of all, for his negotiating at the beginning of January 2013, in the tax negotiations, along with the acceptance of the very structured and restrictive and non-growth number of 986 for the budgeting of this particular Nation.

We are a growing Nation, we are a thriving Nation, we are the most powerful Nation in the world, and the way to go forward is to invest in America's people. So I thank the President. I thank the President for recognizing, as devastating as the sequester was, that he was willing to cede to a supercommittee that did not fulfill its responsibilities.

So we are here. And this is not about individual Members of Congress. It is about the American people. It is about the 29-year employee in the Dallas-Fort Worth area that spoke eloquently to the fact that, combined with military service, she desired to be at work. She enjoyed working with her young child and being at his school, but she wanted to help Americans. But she is not able to go to work.

It speaks to this question of the willy-nilly structure that the Republicans have constructed. I use the term "martial law." For those who want to understand it better, we were speaking of martial rule. So it is martial law on this floor. But a martial rule we are using means that whatever is thrown down on the floor, what Legos are thrown down on the floor to be picked up, that is how we are running this government.

So the word "clean bill" is not a naughty word. It means that we want to fulfill the ability to fund the entire government, not to leave out the SNAP and WIC programs or school food programs that are suffering, not to leave out rural development or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Centers for Disease Control that announced today there is a salmonella epidemic and because we don't have those staff persons, America suffers.

□ 1100

I understand Senator MCCAIN's frustration on the floor of the United States Senate because I went to the floor yesterday in the early morning hours to express my pain for the families who have lost their loved ones in

Afghanistan. These are young men and young women; and because of our government shutdown, their memorial services benefits could not be had.

I planned the introduction of a bill, ceded to the bill that is now going to be on the floor, that now we are going to pick to be able to help them. I indicated yesterday in a letter to the Secretary that he should immediately provide them with their funds, that it was eligible under a particular law. We all come together around that issue, and we are pained because of the loss of those loved ones of those family members.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is not about us. I continue to say that we are not doing it the right way.

A Vietnam veteran in Houston, Mr. Richard Simon, who came to a veterans center, was turned away yesterday. Homeless veterans in Houston, who need the veterans service centers, were turned away as of Wednesday because all of these veterans centers are being closed down. A farmer in Iowa, John Gilbert, has 770 acres. He is working every day, but he can't get his agricultural resources because the Department of Agriculture has shut down. A family resource center that is dealing with domestic violence is no more because it cannot get its Federal dollars. Then, of course, the U.S. Attorney's Office has seen 4,000 U.S. Attorneys shut down. There have been 3,000 Lockheed employees laid off and 3,000 NASA employees laid off.

So I believe that it is important that we recognize that we are not here for ourselves, rather, that we are here for the families whose loved ones lay down their lives in Afghanistan. Whether we call it a clean bill—however we call it—it needs to be put on the floor of the House because we cannot run the government by playing Legos. We can't throw sticks on the ground. We can't be out on the corner playing those games, throwing things on the ground, and saying, Whatever happens, it will happen.

We have got to help Richard Simon. We have got to help the veterans who are going to these closed centers. We have got to make sure that we understand that a President should be judged for his leadership in this country and not on where he came from or what he looks like. We have to be able to work with all people in America—and all of the people are being harmed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this one question as I go to my seat: Are we going to leave homeless veterans on the street, Mr. Speaker? I hope that we will answer that question and also pay the veterans or their families for the memorial services.

THE PRESIDENT'S REFUSAL TO NEGOTIATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, politics is full of irony, and I believe that that

is a vast understatement compared to what is exhibited on this floor almost every day. Sometimes that irony bleeds over into the absurd, and that's what we are facing today when it comes to our President, who absolutely refuses to even sit down and negotiate over the debt ceiling limit or over the implementation of ObamaCare or over the continuing resolution or, frankly, over anything else.

Think about that.

The President of the United States is unwilling to even sit down to have any negotiations—to have even a conversation—with the Speaker of the House.

The President likes to say, I won the election, and he likes to remind us that elections have consequences; but I would remind the President that I won my election as well and so did 233 other House Republicans. I represent more than 700,000 people. Those 233 House Republicans represent more than 150 million people. They expect certain things of us. They expect us to represent them. They expect us to fight for those values that we promised that we would. I can't abandon those values. I owe it to my constituents. I owe it to my family. I owe it to my Nation. I owe it to myself to continue to fight for those values that, I think, help to make this Nation the great Nation that it is.

The President is the President of the United States. He is not just the President of the Democratic Party. He is not just the President of those States in which he won. He is the President of the United States, and he owes it to the Americans to be willing to sit down and to try to negotiate when we come into a conflict such as we have now.

Yes, we've got great challenges before us, but we can work through these. We always have before. We can find a way to work together. Republicans and Democrats have been working through their differences for generations, but we can only do that if we are willing to sit down and talk with each other. We can only do that if we are willing to be respectful of the deeply held positions that each of us holds. We can only do that if we are willing to work together for the betterment of this Nation, which brings me to the debt limit.

It is like a dark, looming cloud that hangs over us now. We can't ignore it. We can't pretend that it doesn't matter. We can't pretend that it's not important. So, like others, I would like to quote from one who is considered to be a great political leader of this century:

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. "Leadership" means that the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and our grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, of course I'm not quoting TED CRUZ or MITCH MCCONNELL or the Speaker of the House. I am quoting a young freshman Senator who is now the President of the United

States, who at least at one point in his career recognized the serious and the longstanding threat to this Nation that our rising debt is.

We have the opportunity to work together now to fix this problem; and if we can't fix it, at least we can take a meaningful step forward. I hope the President will work with us to address what he used to believe was a serious problem, but I believe it starts with one thing: sitting down together and talking in order to work it out.

The American citizens—all of us—deserve a President who is willing to lead. The American people deserve a President who is willing to talk. Yes, we live in a day in which there are policy and political differences, but that has always been the case. From the birth of our Nation, it has always been such. We are a Nation in which ideas and principles sometimes conflict, but the American people deserve a President who understands that negotiating is part of the process.

I pray that the President will sit down and talk with us now.

MR. SPEAKER, LET YOUR PEOPLE GO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I have a very simple message: let your people go.

The American people are very frustrated by what we are doing here. They want us to end this shutdown. In fact, some 70 percent of them do not like the way you or the Republican majority is handling this crisis. So, Mr. Speaker, if you will just let your people go and allow us to bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor, we can end this. Despite your claims to the contrary, it is clear to everyone that we have at least 17 votes required from your side of the aisle to pass the continuing resolution. So, Mr. Speaker, why don't you just let your people go?

I have a simple question for you: If you think to the contrary that their votes are not there, then why not put your cards on the table and allow a vote?

The American people cannot afford more rounds of betting their economic futures on politicians' betting on a pair and thinking they have a full house. The American people think it's time to call your bluff. Mr. Speaker, let your people go.

We can reopen the World War II Memorial and the VA today. We can ensure that all military families receive death benefits and can travel to Dover Air Force Base to receive their loved ones' remains. We can end what Senators on the other side of the aisle have declared "shameful and embarrassing."

We can end this today, Mr. Speaker, if you let your people go.

Holding back on a vote prevents the opening of lifesaving clinical trials at the NIH. It prevents the opening of na-

tional parks and museums for use by families everywhere. The shutdown is costing taxpayers \$12.5 million each and every hour you refuse to vote, and it is costing the American people already \$2.5 billion.

Don't listen to me. Listen to your own caucus Members: Enough is enough, said one Republican in the House. Let's get on with the business we were sent to do.

Another Republican agreed with him: The politics should be over, he said. It's time to legislate.

Another said: I'd vote for a clean CR because I don't think this strategy is working.

Many more echo these sentiments, Mr. Speaker: let your people go. Instead, you seem to be listening to a small faction in your caucus that says they want to "win at any cost." They say they won't be disrespected and that they need to get something out of this, but they don't know what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will see what is clear to everyone around the world who is watching this spectacle: there are no winners. Mr. Speaker, let your people go.

It's blackmail to shut down the government because you don't like the Affordable Care Act. Mr. Speaker, listen to those blunt assessments from your own caucus who call the followers of this strategy "lemmings with suicide vests."

Traditional allies of the GOP, like the Chamber of Commerce, have said this is "not in the best interest of the U.S. business community."

The Wall Street Journal has called it a kamikaze mission, and in fact, in their editorial headline, they said: Are the Republicans nuts?

Another Republican Senator said: This strategy isn't good for America.

This last comment really says it best, that this is not good for America. Mr. Speaker, let your people go, and bring a clean CR to a vote.

THE DEFINITION OF "FAIR"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, I was elected—and so were a lot of my classmates—in what we termed a very fair election. I think the issue that we all need to be concerned about right now is that it is truly unique in America that everybody is treated fairly. It doesn't matter what the color of your skin is; it doesn't matter how you worship; it doesn't matter if you even worship or don't worship—you are treated fairly. The President has said many times that this is a country in which everybody deserves a fair shot, in which everybody deserves a fair opportunity to rise to whatever level he can. Every single American deserves to be treated fairly. I hear that term. I hear it batted back and forth.

So what is the real definition of "fair"?

I went to Webster's Dictionary. It says "fair" is treating people in a way that does not favor some over others. It does not treat one person in a favorable way over somebody else.

That is truly, uniquely American because there are very few places in the world where everybody does get treated fairly.

When I look at the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, I ask myself: Is this really fair?

If you look at this definition, it goes farther down and gives the antonym, or the opposite meaning. I would say that, if you were to look at what is not fair, the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, would be one of those things that would be the direct opposite of what fair is.

Is it fair to give 1,200 waivers to some and not to others? Is it fair to say to employers, do you know what, this is a very complicated law, and it has grown so complicated that you need another year to give you a fair chance to understand what's in it, so we're going to give you a year's delay. Now, if you're an individual, no, you're not given that.

So my question is: Is it fair? Is it fair to give one group something and the individual not?

I don't know. I don't know that that meets anybody's definition of what fair is.

Also, I heard Secretary of Health and Human Services Sebelius asked that very same question by a journalist:

So, Secretary Sebelius, is it fair to go ahead and give employers 1 year to figure it out because it's so hard to understand that it's not really fair to put that kind of pressure on them; yet, with the individuals, they have to do it today?

She says: No, no, no. They can opt out if they're not ready to do that. Now, you have to pay a fine if you want to opt out. You have to pay a fine if you don't want to participate at all.

You are held to a different set of standards than another group, so I don't know how that fits under the definition of fair.

We can talk about this and go back and forth all day long, but this is a gift. This Affordable Care Act—this ObamaCare—is a gift that keeps giving. It's a law that, while it's giving, it's also taking. It is driving our debt to an unbelievable level. The President says it's going to reduce our debt over the long run. The truth of the matter is in 10 years it adds \$1.8 trillion, and that's a pretty fairly heavy debt for the people to absorb.

Now, back home—and I don't know if this lady is a Republican or a Democrat—Melissa had written to me from Hermitage, Pennsylvania. I want you to understand how this is. This is an individual. She has two degrees, one in criminal justice and one in teaching, but she couldn't get a job, so she started her own business.

She says:

No government loans, no bank loans, no investors, and I have grown the business over the past handful of years. I received a letter from my insurance provider, Aetna, and according to my letter, no longer am I going to be covered after November 25. I operate a small business, a successful business in this economy.

Now she talks about her daughter, Riley:

Riley is a young girl who is working her way through school as a part-time cashier at a local grocery store. She makes minimum wage, and she is paying for her own health care benefits. She got a letter, saying, Do you know what, your policy that you have now is going to go from \$70 a month, and it's going to triple. It is going to put a heavy weight on her in order for her to stay covered.

So we talk about fair, and we talk about what's fair to everybody—not just to a few but to everybody. My friends get up, and they rail about what we are not doing, about how we are not treating the law fairly. The law is not treating us fairly. Sadly, we are in a time when Americans don't expect an awful lot out of Washington. In fact, it's fair to say they don't expect hardly anything out of Washington, but they do expect to be treated fairly.

So I would say to everybody: Please, let's treat everybody the same. This is America. That's what makes us unique, and that's what makes us special.

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY'S 100TH-YEAR ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Concordia University of Chicago is an American private Lutheran liberal arts university, located in the village of River Forest, Illinois, 10 miles west of downtown Chicago.

In 1855, Lutheran ministers Friedrich Johann, Carl Lochner, and Philipp Fleischmann established a private teachers seminary in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, to train day school teachers for Lutheran schools. In 1857, the responsibility for the operation of the school was taken over by the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. The synod moved the school to Fort Wayne, Indiana, uniting it with a theological seminary which had been founded there by followers of Johann Konrad and Wilhelm Lohe. In 1861, the theological seminary was moved to St. Louis, Missouri, later to Springfield, Illinois, and then back to Fort Wayne, Indiana, in 1864. The teachers seminary was moved to Addison, Illinois. Concordia University makes its foundation with the 1864 move to Addison, Illinois.

Originally called Concordia Teachers Seminary, then Concordia Teachers College, the institution is the oldest in the Concordia University system. The original building is gone, but a monument still stands on the site of the seminary in Addison, Illinois.

In 1913, the college moved to its present campus in River Forest, Illinois. In 1979, the institution expanded its education-centered program to become a full liberal arts institution, and it changed its name to Concordia College. In 1990, having experienced a tremendous growth in its graduate offerings, the school recognized and changed its name to Concordia University. The university was officially known as Concordia University, River Forest until 2006, when the current name was adopted.

In 2006, CURF was the only university in the 10-school system to achieve the rank of top tier on U.S. News & World Report's "best college" list. They were also awarded this ranking in 2010.

Concordia University Chicago has a prominent and a prestigious music department among schools of a similar size. However, education is still Concordia's largest academic program. Other programs include business, communications, theology, and many other undergraduate degree programs. Concordia University's enrollment for the 2012-2013 academic year is 5,454 students, and many of these students plan to become church workers.

I am inspired when I read the university's mission statement, which is:

As a distinct, comprehensive university of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, centered in the gospel of Jesus Christ and based in the liberal arts, Concordia University equips men and women to serve and lead with integrity, creativity and compassion in a diverse, interconnected and increasingly urbanized church and world.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate and salute Concordia University on its 100 years of teaching and service in the Chicagoland community.

DEATH BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a fallen soldier from my district, and I urge the passage of a bill later today to ensure that death benefits still flow to the families of our military heroes despite the government shutdown.

Army Ranger Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins, from Carlisle, Pennsylvania, was killed this past Sunday by an IED.

Sergeant Hawkins was on his fourth tour in Afghanistan and was serving as a rifleman, a gun team leader, and a Ranger team leader when he was killed. Fittingly, he was tending to another wounded Ranger when he was killed. Sergeant Hawkins was clearly following part of the Army Ranger creed, which says:

I will never leave a fallen comrade.

Mr. Speaker, we should take that advice as well here in this body and not leave behind Sergeant Hawkins' wife, Brittanie, of Lansing, Kansas, or his parents, Roy and Sheila Hawkins, of Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

Here in the House, we thought we had taken care of this problem by passing our Pay Our Military Act soon after the shutdown occurred; but, apparently, the Pentagon wants to have more explicit guidance on their ability to provide the death benefits to military families. So let it be said loudly and clearly here in the House of Representatives: we will never leave a fallen comrade.

I urge my colleagues to pass the bill to make sure that the \$100,000 gratuity is paid to cover final costs for Sergeant Hawkins and for all of our other brave men and women in service and that loved ones left behind receive what they are entitled to. I hope that the Senate follows suit and that the President signs it into law so that there is no further delay.

May God bless Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins and all others like him who defend our freedoms every day.

OBAMA REFUSES TO PAY MILITARY DEATH BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am gravely disappointed at the lengths the White House has gone in order to manipulate American lives as they seek to coerce America's elected House of Representatives into spending money America does not have on a dysfunctional, socialized medicine program that does not work, that threatens American lives, and that a majority of Americans do not want.

Congress and the White House agree on, roughly, 99 percent of Federal Government spending. We should fund that 99 percent, reopen the Federal Government, and debate our disagreements on the remaining 1 percent, but the White House and Senate refuse to do that. Instead, President Obama, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID and their Democrat allies force a Federal Government shutdown. They hold 99 percent of the Federal Government hostage to support their all-or-nothing demands.

The lengths the Democrats and the White House will go in order to manipulate American lives and public opinion is most disheartening.

The Obama administration ordered the closings of all Washington, D.C., monuments, thereby denying World War II veterans access to their memorial. Never mind that, in the history of all Federal Government shutdowns, no President has ever ordered and spent taxpayer money to barricade and close Washington's open-air memorials.

The Obama administration disregarded the Pay Our Military Act and illegally ordered furloughs of, roughly, 400,000 Department of Defense civilian personnel for a week, thereby disrupting their lives and, more importantly, jeopardizing America's national security. The Obama administration followed that up with illegally ordering furloughs for who-knows-how-many

thousands of defense contractors and their employees.

Never mind that, in doing so, the Obama administration violated the Pay Our Military Act that President Obama, himself, signed—an act that fully funds all defense workers and contractors who “are providing support to members of the Armed Forces,” which, by the way, is all of them.

Yesterday, America woke up to yet another political manipulation by the Obama administration. America’s Commander in Chief denied death gratuities to the families of four soldiers and a marine who were killed in Afghanistan. Adding insult to injury, America’s Commander in Chief refuses to pay the cost of the burial expenses of our men and women in uniform who have given their lives for their country.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrage. It must not stand.

The Obama administration claims:

As a result of the shutdown, we do not have the legal authority to make death gratuity payments at this time.

I respectfully disagree.

The Pay Our Military Act expressly states:

There are hereby appropriated sums for fiscal year 2014, such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces.

Death benefits and burial expenses are part of our military’s compensation package, a part of the “pay and allowances” the Pay Our Military Act says the Obama administration must pay. Congress should not have to pass yet another bill today to force the President to do what the law already says he should do.

Instead of punishing America’s military by illegally furloughing defense workers and contractors, instead of dishonoring our World War II veterans, our Korean war veterans, our Vietnam veterans by spending taxpayer money to barricade their memorials and by denying them access to their memorials, I yearn for a Commander in Chief who supports our veterans and our men and women in uniform rather than using them as pawns to be sacrificed in partisan, political games. I cannot help but think of the contrast between our current Commander in Chief and our first one.

During the Revolutionary War, George Washington lived with his troops, fought with his troops, and sacrificed for his troops. When the Continental Army was faced with hardship, inadequate food and clothing, George Washington reached into his own pocket and sacrificed his wealth to help the men who fought under his command.

Mr. Speaker, I pray our current Commander in Chief will study and understand the graciousness, the leadership, and the sacrifices of George Washington as he makes decisions on whether to treat our veterans, our troops, and our defense workers with the respect they have earned and deserve.

DENYING MILITARY DEATH BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the legislation that will be considered on the floor of the House today, legislation that would address the unacceptable wrong of denying death benefits to the families of fallen soldiers during the budget impasse.

While I, no doubt, expect our Chamber to pass this critical funding bill that the American people have a right to expect—I hope it’s passed not just in a bipartisan fashion, but I hope it’s passed unanimously in the House—we must consider what has led us to even have to legislatively fix such an obvious injustice.

The Department of Defense, even during the current impasse, is spending sums in the billions of dollars.

How is the debt payment for members of the military not considered essential, Mr. President? What was the decision-making process to deem the death benefits nonessential, Mr. President? Who made the final call in this decision, and why are you not firing that person?

This follows the same pattern that we saw earlier this year when the President cut military tuition assistance. We were able to restore those needless cuts and have introduced a bill to ensure the President does not continue to play games with the tuition assistance as early reports indicate that military tuition is again being held back from families. Simply put, we made promises to our fighting men and women and their families.

Mr. Speaker, the House is ready to keep those promises, but the President is demonstrating, at best, a failure to lead and, at worst, bare knuckle partisanship.

AN ADULT CONVERSATION ABOUT FIXING OUR ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President and his allies claim that the shutdown of government is about one thing—a Republican obsession with ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, they are missing the point completely.

For the past 3 years, the House has been working to improve our economy, to create private sector jobs, and to address barriers that inhibit economic growth. ObamaCare, unfortunately, has emerged as one of the largest challenges standing in the way of job creation: workers are having their hours cut; families and businesses are facing higher premiums; employers aren’t expanding because of the uncertainty.

Fixing the health care law would have the quickest impact on the economy; but, in fairness, we can’t do that unless the other side sits down and talks to us. Thus far, the Senate and the President have rejected all efforts of the House and refuse to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, this debate should be about caring for the American people, their futures, and the liberties we share in America. We want to reopen the government and help families find jobs, but that requires that the House and the Senate and the President sit down together and have an adult conversation about fixing our economy.

TIME TO PAY THE PIPER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, as the clock ticks, the country gets closer to a time when it will run out of money.

People probably couldn’t understand all of the debate leading up to the implementation of ObamaCare just a few days ago, and some of the questions and debate became blurred. That was one of the biggest government programs—largest spending programs—probably in the history of our Nation; but it did have consequences, because you are spending more trillions of dollars, and if we are going to provide health care, we want it right. There are many Americans who don’t have health care, and we should assist them in a responsible fashion. The roll-out has been a disaster. We are holding a hearing on that in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

All that being said, it’s about time to pay the piper here. I think the American people will understand, and can understand, that the country is close to default. The country is close to default because we have incurred an indebtedness that will soon exceed \$17 trillion, an indebtedness which, again, will reach the current limit next week. They are asking for another \$1 trillion or \$900 billion to get us one more year. We are going to have to pay the piper.

When you spend \$1.5 trillion more a year in the first year with the Obama administration and, in each succeeding year, over \$1 trillion more than you took in, you acquire an indebtedness. It was \$9 trillion when President Bush left office, and it will soon be \$18 trillion in some 6 years, the most indebtedness of any nation. We can’t become a Greece. This is not that difficult to understand.

When the government can’t pay its bills, if folks think there is a temporary shutdown now, think of a permanent shutdown. Think of going to the bank and not being able to withdraw money or, as you’ve heard, not being able to obtain a mortgage. The full faith and credit of the United States of America will collapse. Just like when an individual spends more than he earns, he must pay the piper.

Hopefully now, everyone can understand we are in that situation and that we must act responsibly.

Republicans are not standing in the way. Republicans are trying to save the day because this is coming due. The bill is due. We must find a way to cut spending, reduce the amount of Federal spending and keep the debt down. It's that simple. If the President of the United States will not negotiate and if the Senate will not negotiate, you cannot achieve what we need to do to be responsible as stewards of the American people. We are one half of one-third of the government, so this isn't all our responsibility.

We are trying to act responsibly, and we are asking people to come together and find a way to reduce spending in a responsible manner. If we have got problems with some programs like ObamaCare, let's fix them. Let's get this spending down. Again, this is the time we are going to have to pay for all of these government programs, for the spending that has gone on unchecked and for the indebtedness the United States has incurred.

Just a final lesson: the Constitution and the Founders put all spending—the appropriations, the funding of programs—and also the responsibility for raising taxes with this body, the House of Representatives. They did so because we are closest to the people. We get elected every 2 years. They chose to have the Republicans in the majority in order to control the spending that went out of control and the government programs that went out of control.

So that is what we are doing, what they sent us here to do; and we must do it in a responsible fashion. We are here. We were here before the shutdown. We have asked to negotiate. We will continue to do that. Our leaders are committed to doing that, to working in a responsible fashion. We have to get this right. We must pay the piper. The piper is calling our bills and our credit due, so let's join together and act responsibly.

THEIR WAY OR THE HIGHWAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 3 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, members of the Republican Women's Policy Committee sent an earnest letter to Senator HARRY REID, asking him to please put aside the partisanship for a second and to take the opportunity to enact commonsense legislation to help our kids; take up bipartisan House legislation to restore WIC; to open NIH; and to fund Head Start.

Senator REID has done nothing, though, and President Obama said that it's their way or the highway, to give them everything they want or get lost.

In North Carolina, our WIC program doesn't have sufficient funds to issue new vouchers until the Senate acts.

It's the Senate's choice. They should do the right thing. At this point, however, the Senate is rejecting common ground.

Senate Democrats are refusing to make government work for the American people because they won't even agree to having a conversation about whether all Americans should be treated equally under ObamaCare. Health care is a matter of security to many Americans; and health care, as we all know, is changing drastically next year. For many in North Carolina, it is becoming more expensive; and for others, their plans are being canceled.

When asked why American families are being denied a 1-year delay of the individual mandate so they can figure out ObamaCare without having the threat of government penalties, the Secretary of Health and Human Services suggested that the way to "opt out" of the mandate was to simply allow government to levy a fine against you. That sounds like a fair choice, doesn't it? Individual Americans do what we want or pay an unprecedented tax on your behavior. Mr. Speaker, the refusal even to acknowledge the specter of unfairness in ObamaCare's implementation is shocking.

Consider the great lengths Senate Democrats are going in order to prove a point about not negotiating: Senate Democrats won't call a vote on legislation to fund the National Institutes of Health, to ensure pay for Guardsmen and Reservists, to stop veteran benefit application delays, to fully fund WIC, to restore Head Start, to restore FEMA or FDA funding. Senate Democrats won't call a vote to reopen the national parks.

Throwing all of this common ground by the wayside—common ground that will help people—is inexcusable. The President and the Senate need to start explaining why their way or the highway is more important than doing their jobs and finding a compromise to end this shutdown.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Rod MacIlvaine, Grace Community Church, Bartlesville, Oklahoma, offered the following prayer:

Father, I thank You for the heroic leadership that this House of Rep-

resentatives has exemplified in the past week during this present crisis. I thank You for their late nights. I thank You for their efforts to seek compromise. And I thank You for the creative solutions they have proposed.

Yet, Lord, at present, there is no solution. So today, Father, we confess our desperate need for You. We joyfully concur that You are the source of wisdom, and all strength resides with You. You are the author of unity even when parties are in conflict. So we ask that You would grant supernatural breakthrough.

Where there is no way forward, we pray that You would forge a way. When negotiations break down, please grant fresh ideas for debate.

We ask this, Lord, for Your glory and for the good of the American people.

We pray this in Jesus' name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. ROD MACILVAINE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of our guest chaplain, Dr. Rod MacIlvaine. Rod MacIlvaine is the founding senior pastor of Grace Community Church in Bartlesville, Oklahoma, a community just north of Tulsa.

He also serves as a fellow with the Veritas Center for Faith, Freedom, and Justice at Oklahoma Wesleyan University, and he is an adjunct professor in the doctor of ministry department at Dallas Theological Seminary.

His ministry at Grace Community Church concentrates not only on worshipping the risen Christ, but also on equipping people to serve the city, especially helping people recover from substance abuse and painful pasts.

For the past 10 years, he has also worked through a missions organization he cofounded called "Grace Missions International."

He and his wife, Cindy, have been married for 34 years, and they have

four children: Sarah, Kristin, Caleb, and Jared, and six grandchildren, including one adopted from Uganda.

I want to thank Dr. MacIlvaine for serving as our guest chaplain today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLINS of Georgia). The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, when the hallmark of "Presidential leadership" becomes the refusal to have a conversation, we all should be concerned.

Our country is facing some very real challenges right now. To name a few:

Government is shut down because the Democrat Senate won't fund operations unless the House allows ObamaCare to be implemented unfairly;

Families in my district will be forced to spend thousands more next year on health insurance because of the President's partisan health care overhaul;

The country is days away from exhausting its \$16.7 trillion debt limit.

These challenges are bigger than any one party, and our solutions must be, too.

Not negotiating when such pivotal matters are at stake is wrong. It betrays years of precedent, and it contradicts the bipartisan reality of divided government.

House Republicans want to reopen government as soon as possible, but we can't shape a fair bipartisan solution when we're the only ones willing to sit down, talk to the other side, and negotiate.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican mantra of the day is that the President won't negotiate. Give me and the American people a break.

The President sat down with Republicans many times, and I think he tried harder and longer than he should have to reach bipartisan agreements. The cuts they produced hurt my and many other communities.

A popular definition of "insanity" is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result.

The Biden task force, the Simpson-Bowles, and the Domenici-Rivlin Commissions were bipartisan and produced nothing. I recall the Speaker walking out on one of the talks.

In the temporary CRs, Budget Control Act and lifting the debt ceiling in

the last Congress, Democrats compromised on important programs, and, frankly, there's no place left to cut.

As the President said yesterday, "I don't know why Democrats right now would agree to a format that takes off the table all the things they care about and is confined only to the things the Republicans care about."

To go to the table with a gun to our heads in a decidedly one-sided negotiation would really be insanity.

We need to, as Chaplain Black prayed last week, "stop the madness" and restore sanity in this House. Mr. Speaker, you can do that today by bringing a clean CR for a vote and lifting the debt ceiling so that the United States can pay its debts.

IRAN SANCTIONS

(Mr. HOLDING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, a nuclear-armed Iran is simply unacceptable and would pose a grave national security threat to our Nation and our allies.

Sanctions against the Iranian regime are having an effect on their nation's economy and remain a key tool for U.S. policymakers. Unfortunately, the Obama administration is asking to delay new sanctions following all the talk about historic, high-level meetings, and phone calls.

Mr. Speaker, now is not the time to be fooled by the rhetoric coming out of Tehran, especially as they push harder every day to develop a nuclear bomb. Before we even begin to discuss any deal with Tehran, we need to increase the pressure that has been working. It's time for the Senate to pass the House's new round of sanctions, which recently passed on this very floor with 400 votes.

Each day the Iranian regime is able to further drag out the promise of talks is another day that centrifuges will keep spinning. Once they're done spinning, they won't have any need to talk again.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, we are now in day 9 of the Republican government shutdown.

Let's keep it real. Come on. This could end tonight if Republicans vote "yes" on a clean CR. The problem is that the Republicans only want to pass partisan bills with no attempts to reach across the aisle. Instead, Republicans are bringing bills up for votes that claim to fund the VA, feed children, and cure deadly diseases when, in fact, they actually reduce funding for these very important programs. The appeasement of the far right, the Tea Party, is the opposite of good gov-

erning and bipartisanship, and it needs to stop today.

As a freshman Member of Congress, I am disheartened by my Republican colleagues' inability to compromise for the benefit of the American people. It's not fair to the constituents that I represent in places like Grand Prairie, people who work at the old Carswell Air Force Base and the Naval Air Station Fort Worth who were recently furloughed as nonessential employees. It's unfair to punish the 62,000 Federal workers in the Dallas-Fort Worth area who have faced uncertain work status as a result of these partisan games.

I urge Republican leadership to stop the parlor tricks. Everything doesn't have to be a partisan battle. It is time for House Republicans to take "yes" for an answer and end the government shutdown today.

DEATH BENEFITS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, last week before the shutdown, this House overwhelmingly passed legislation to provide for our military in case of a government shutdown. We voted to provide them not only pay, but benefits for themselves and their families. Now the President's lawyers at the Department of Defense are blocking death gratuities to the families of those who've made the ultimate sacrifice.

Families of soldiers killed in battle are being victimized by the Department of Defense. It's outrageous. Today, Congress will act again to make our wishes even more clear. The President is the Commander in Chief. He should not be using troops and their families as pawns in this political bickering. He should be doing everything he can to stand up for the men and women of our military. Instead, he is refusing to negotiate until he gets his way. He is violating the trust between himself as Commander in Chief and the troops and destroying their morale.

Divided government is hard, but it's what the people have given us. It requires negotiation and compromise. Let's provide for our troops and their families. Let's sit down and talk, and let's get the whole government reopened.

IN MEMORY OF NICHOLAS ORESKO, MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT

(Mr. SIREs asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in memory of Master Sergeant Nicholas Oresko, the oldest living Medal of Honor recipient and Bayonne, New Jersey, native, who passed away on October 4, 2013, at the age of 96.

In the final stages of World War II, on January 23, 1945, Master Sergeant

Oresko's unit was pinned down by deadly enemy gunfire as the Battle of the Bulge drew to a close.

As platoon leader with Company C, he made a final, solitary attempt to eliminate the German position in nearby bunkers. Master Sergeant Oresko charged the hill, weathering enemy fire, to throw a grenade into the German bunkers.

Refusing to withdraw from the battle, despite being wounded and weak with blood loss, he continued the assault until he was assured the mission was successfully accomplished. His lone assault wiped out two machine gun positions and enabled his unit to take the hill with minimal casualties.

The true impact of his unselfish actions can never be measured as it extends beyond the lives of the men he saved.

Master Sergeant Oresko was awarded the Medal of Honor by President Harry Truman on October 30, 1945, for his quick thinking, courage, and unswerving devotion to his country and fellow soldiers.

I rise today in memory of Master Sergeant Nicholas Oresko, to honor his courage and to ensure that those who will sacrifice their own safety for the benefit of the Nation are never forgotten.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, our message in the House has been pretty clear. We want to reopen our government and provide fairness to all Americans under the President's health care law.

This law had a big rollout last week. It has been called an "inexcusable mess," a "rolling calamity," "consumers will face dramatically higher rates," "many remain locked out," "surprise, premiums just went up," "instead of making it easier for people to get health insurance, it will be a lot tougher." What a train wreck.

How can we tax people for not buying a product from a Web site that doesn't work? How can you give big businesses a tax break and leave hardworking families out in the cold?

This is why we need to sit down and have a conversation about the big challenges that face our country.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS WEEK

(Mr. LOEBSACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark Mental Health Awareness Week.

I was raised by a mother who struggled with mental illness her entire adult life. I personally know firsthand how important timely and proper intervention and care are for those who

are struggling and how important that care can be.

I want to thank the mental health advocates who have contacted me or whom I have met at Iowa events to raise awareness in my district, events such as the walks hosted by the National Alliance on Mental Illness.

Hearing from those at home in Iowa who are personally affected by mental illness on a daily basis has strengthened my resolve to continue to fight to make improving access to mental health care for all Americans a top priority.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end this shutdown of government and get back to work on the critical issues that face our Nation, including a mental health system that will work for all those who are struggling, as my mom did for so long.

RESPECTING SERVICEMEMBERS AND MILITARY FAMILIES

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, two Army Rangers, a nurse, and an Army criminal investigator were killed in action while defending our freedoms on Sunday. Because of a devastating decision made by the administration, the grieving families of American heroes Sergeant Patrick Hawkins, PFC Cody Patterson, 1st Lieutenant Jennifer Moreno, and Special Agent Joseph Peters are not receiving their loved ones' death gratuities.

Over a dozen more military families are also suffering due to the administration's actions and failure to negotiate. When Congress passed the Pay Our Troops Act last week, it was our intent to pay the pay and benefits our brave men and women have earned and deserve without question.

On Friday, I sent a letter to Secretary of Defense Hagel, demanding answers. Our brave men and women serving in uniform risk their lives to keep American families safe. I appreciate today, as a grateful military dad, that Congress will pass a bill restating benefits to our military families who have earned everlasting respect.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

□ 1215

HONORING THE FAMILIES OF FALLEN SOLDIERS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Standard and Poor's, Mr. Speaker, indicates that the wealth of American families has grown three times since President Obama has taken office. But here comes the government shutdown, the Republican government shutdown.

Yesterday I rose to the floor of the House to mourn the fact that we lost five brave young men and a young woman over the weekend in Afghanistan doing their duty. I wrote to the Secretary of Defense to direct him and ask him to immediately pay those moneys for the memorial services and other dollars to their families.

We all are concerned, but there comes the government shutdown, a shutdown because of something totally unrelated, the Affordable Care Act. Never during the time of Speaker PELOSI did we have a government shutdown. So, today, we will come together, as Republicans and Democrats, mourning the loss of those soldiers and having H.J. Res. 91.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that every single Member be counted as an original cosponsor of this bill to pay those families that are now mourning and that we never, ever again, never, ever again say "no" to our families who have seen their young men and women fall on the battlefield.

We don't have to do this but here comes a government shutdown. Let us all join on this bill. Let us be cosponsors. I ask the leaders of this bill to put every single Member on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain that unanimous-consent request. Cosponsors may be added by the sponsor in the normal, proper format.

RIISING HEALTH CARE COSTS

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I continue to hear the real-world impacts of the implementation and cost of ObamaCare in my congressional district. Just last week, I received an email from CyrusOne, a small business located in my district. Due to ObamaCare, they anticipate paying over \$86,000 more for their current level of health insurance for their employees once ObamaCare is implemented.

For a small business, these significant new costs inhibit their ability to hire new workers or to simply keep the workers they have on the payroll. Consumers will begin to see the impact of these costs in the form of higher prices passed on to them.

Higher prices and fewer jobs, this is not the health care reform that Americans want or deserve. We must repeal or at least delay the individual mandate before it does even more damage to our economic recovery.

DAY 9 OF THE REPUBLICAN SHUTDOWN

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the ninth day of the Republican government shutdown. There are only 8 more days until we hit the debt ceiling.

I was back home in Rhode Island this past weekend, and heard from many of my constituents who are disgusted with what they are seeing here in Washington. The American people expect their elected leaders to work together to get things done for our country, but there has been absolutely no cooperation since this shutdown began from our friends on the other side of the aisle who are committed to ending ObamaCare.

If the House voted right now on a clean funding bill, it would pass with support from both parties, and the government would reopen immediately; but instead, we are spending another day trading political rhetoric instead of working on the serious challenges facing our country.

Just yesterday, the U.S. Department of Education released a study of 23 industrialized nations that found Americans fall below international averages in basic problem-solving and reading and math skills. This problem demands a solution, but Congress can't work on this and so many other important issues until the partisan games end.

Let's open the government, raise the debt ceiling, commit to addressing the long-term budget challenges facing our country, and get back to work for the men and women who sent us here.

BLIZZARD OF 2013

(Mrs. NOEM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday, a storm struck western South Dakota and dumped up to 4 feet of snow throughout the region. This has left thousands without power and devastating livestock losses in the area. Some estimate that hundreds of thousands of livestock have been killed, many of which are still buried in the melting snow.

The weekend's blizzard is expected to cost local governments millions of dollars. Those counties and the Governor are expected to petition the President for disaster status and for FEMA funds so they can clear the fallen trees and help ranchers remove all the cattle that died during that storm.

Some in South Dakota are wondering if this partial government shutdown will affect the timing of potential assistance. It certainly does not have to. There may be disagreement over certain parts of the Federal budget, but not on FEMA.

Last week, the House passed a bill to fund FEMA. It passed with Democrat support because there is bipartisan recognition that we should fund non-controversial aspects of our government and stop the attempts of some to make this partial shutdown as painful as possible. It does not have to be this way.

I call on our Senate colleagues to act immediately on the funding measures that we have sent them. It's time to negotiate, to work together, so that we can end this shutdown.

WE'VE GOT TO OPEN UP GOVERNMENT

(Mr. BERA of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA of California. Day No. 9, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today is day No. 9 of the government shutdown.

Enough with the games, the name calling, the finger-pointing. It's time we come together, open the government, pay our bills, and then begin negotiating a real budget. Yes, let's negotiate a real budget that begins to address our debt and the deficit. But first, we've got to open up government.

In my district, in Rancho Cordova, they've shown us what working together looks like. I spoke with Darcy Brewer, the executive director of the California Capital Airshow. They faced some challenges—high winds, bad weather—but they came together, worked into the night, and didn't shut down. They put on a spectacular airshow.

Mr. Speaker, that's what we do as Americans. When times get tough, we pull together, and we show up. We don't shut down.

THE TWILIGHT ZONE

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask if we've entered the twilight zone.

Last Friday, a bipartisan coalition in the House of Representatives passed House Joint Resolution 75, which ensures the proper funding for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, better known as WIC. Senate Democrats have refused to take action on this legislation, choosing to play political games instead of providing nutritional assistance to low-income pregnant women, new mothers, infants, and young children.

Here's where it gets stranger. President Obama has actually threatened to veto the legislation. The President of the United States is threatening to veto nutritional assistance for little babies and preschoolers?

This isn't a game. Yesterday, North Carolina stopped using WIC benefits because of this unfortunate shutdown.

America elected a divided government, but they expect us to work together. Mr. Speaker, the President needs to convey to the Senate Democrats that they must come to the negotiating table. Senate Democrats must rejoin the normal legislative process. Let's talk.

FURLOUGHED FEDERAL CONTRACTORS

(Ms. TSONGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had a heart-wrenching conversation with a nurse employed at a military installation in my district. She has been furloughed because of the Republican government shutdown. As a Federal contract employee, she is terrified that she won't be able to recover her lost pay, putting her family at financial risk. "We are the ones suffering," she told me. "We are hard-working Americans working paycheck to paycheck. Something like this can destroy us."

No piecemeal approach, no temporary fix here or there is going to put an end to this reckless shutdown. Only one bill is guaranteed to reopen all of the government—or even any part of it today—and put this nurse and hundreds of thousands of Americans like her back to work.

It is time for the House to vote on the straightforward, Senate-passed funding bill. Mr. Speaker, let us vote.

PUTTING OUR TROOPS BEFORE POLITICS

(Mr. SMITH of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday people across this country were shocked to learn that families of troops who died in combat are being denied death benefits, including a fellow Missourian. Like so many in my district, I was appalled to see news reports showing so little respect or care for the families of troops who made the ultimate sacrifice.

Many issues divide us in this body, but surely Democrats and Republicans can come together to support our troops and to support their families. This issue should rise above any political divide. Troops who lay down their lives in battle should never be forgotten or forsaken by their government.

Today, the House will vote on H.J. Res. 91, Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers. I am hopeful this legislation will then be taken up immediately by the Senate and then quickly signed into law by President Obama. We must correct this wrong.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask every American to join me in prayer for the troops we have lost and for their families who were forgotten by our government.

STOP THE RECKLESSNESS

(Ms. CHU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER says he doesn't have the votes to pass a clean bill that would keep government open. Yet 198 Democrats would vote for it; another 21 Republicans say they would, too. That's more than the 217 votes needed to pass a bill. That's basic math. The votes are there.

And yet so many people are suffering in this ninth day of the GOP shutdown,

people like Leo Finn, who had been scheduled to start a clinical trial at a cancer institute in Boston to battle his liver cancer, but last week, he was told he couldn't because of the shutdown.

The National Institutes of Health has furloughed 73 percent of its staff. Leo, a father of three, says:

Everyone talks about national parks, but the shutdown of the NIH is starting to affect people's lives and whether someone will survive a disease.

Now Leo's life is on hold.

It is time for Speaker BOEHNER to stop this recklessness. It is wrong. It is shameful. Bring a clean bill up for a vote.

PLAN FOR PAYING DOWN THE DEBT

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, the American people understand the importance of making tough decisions and balancing their budgets.

According to the Federal Reserve, over the past 3 months, Americans have worked to pay down their credit card debts by more than \$6 billion; yet the United States Government continues to operate in the red, as it has operated in the red 55 of the last 60 years. Our national debt now stands at \$17 trillion. Now the administration is asking Congress to increase our debt by trillions more.

Mr. Speaker, Americans do not want to raise the debt ceiling again unless they see a path towards paying down the national debt and balancing the Federal budget. American citizens cannot take out a loan without a plan to pay it back. How can our Nation continue to borrow money without any plan to pay it back?

Mr. Speaker, let's stop the culture of debt and despair in Washington, D.C. Let's put a plan in place to pay down our debt, and let's get our country back on solid financial footing.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN EFFECTS ON CONSTITUENTS

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as I awoke this morning and read my local newspaper, I realized that my dear friend Greg Taylor is lying in a medical bed, mostly paralyzed and barely able to breathe, as he copes with ALS, or Lou Gehrig's disease.

This past December, Greg lost his business. If this is not bad enough, Greg's long-time partner of 28 years, Albert Sanchez, was just furloughed, a member of the Department of Defense. Although he may now return back to work, this stress is unbearable as they both struggle to make house payments. I failed to mention, they also have a 19-year-old son.

Today is the ninth day of this government shutdown. We still must do something to stop this shutdown.

Speaker BOEHNER, the Democrats have compromised by agreeing to your budget numbers. Now it is time for you to compromise by giving us a clean bill to vote for.

Let's stop this nightmare. I urge us to move forward.

□ 1230

IT'S TIME TO STOP PLAYING GAMES

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, over 1 week ago, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID shut down the government rather than have an honest conversation about the problems facing this country.

The House has passed not one, not two, not three, but four separate bills that would have kept the government running, while ensuring basic fairness for all Americans under the President's health care law.

And even after the United States Senate rejected every single one of these bills, still House Republicans asked to simply have a conversation, and the Senate said no.

So here we are. House Republicans are working and will continue to work to fund important government functions like medical research and benefits for our veterans. We hope the Senate and the President will join us in these efforts.

It's time for the President and the Senate to stop playing games at the expense of the American people.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF JOHN DOLAN

(Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, often people overlook the treasures in their own backyards; and in Vermont, one of our treasures is the Vermont Institute of Natural Science, an institution that has provided environmental education for young Vermonters since the early 1970s. It has provided help through education, research, avian wildlife, and rehabilitation programs.

Thousands of children in New England have grown up with VINS and taken the lessons they've learned about environmental responsibility and sustainability with them into their adult lives.

Sustaining such a mission over the long term requires persistent work and agile leadership. Dolan has succeeded. He served as VINS president for 8 years and retired on October 1.

John led VINS through a transformation that made it more resilient.

He brought renewed focus to the environmental mission of VINS by enhancing the visitors center, expanding the nature camps, and hosting regional events focused on the environment. He created new partnerships, including an expansive research and education program with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Dolan's leadership helped VINS sustain its inspiring mission, and he leaves the institute stronger than when he came. On behalf of all who have benefited from VINS and who continue to enjoy it, I offer John my thanks and best wishes for his future.

Vermonters are proud of this backyard treasure and heartened that VINS is here to stay.

LET'S TONE DOWN THE RHETORIC

(Mr. WEBER of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans continue to call on Senate Democrats and the President to come to the table and negotiate.

Here's one way to start: let's tone down the rhetoric.

Is it proper to refer to someone you don't agree with as a "hostage taker" or as a "legislative arsonist"?

I don't think so. We may disagree on policy, but this kind of rancor will not solve anything.

Let's work together. It can be done. The House just passed a bill which was not just bipartisan but unanimous that guaranteed back pay for Federal workers, and the bill has the support of the Senate and the President. That's encouraging.

Now the Senate should take up the other bipartisan funding bills we passed here in the House to fund things like medical research and veterans benefits.

Let's negotiate. The American people deserve for us to get this government reopened.

I'm RANDY WEBER and I am proud to be an American.

LET'S MAKE D.C. LISTEN

(Mr. HIMES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, when Senator CRUZ took to the Senate floor for 21 hours to explain to the American public why the Congress had to shut down the government and breach the debt ceiling in order to repeal the Affordable Care Act, I listened carefully. One of the themes was, make D.C. listen. Make D.C. listen.

We know, from polling, that 70 percent of Americans oppose shutting down the government to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

But I went, on Monday, to listen to a couple of my constituents, Tamika Younger and Carla Carey, of Bridgeport. These are two young mothers who

drop their children at Head Start in Bridgeport every single day so that they can go off to their jobs to make the money to give those children some quality of life.

Thanks to the Republican government shutdown, there is no Head Start in Bridgeport now, and they are scrambling and putting their jobs at risk to find something to do with those children they love.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's make D.C. listen to 70 percent of Americans and to Tamika and to Carla, who have very real problems today.

RECOGNIZING NOBEL PRIZE WINNERS PETER HIGGS AND FRANCOIS ENGLERT

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the scientists at Fermilab in my district for their work to find the Higgs particle.

Yesterday, Peter Higgs and Francois Englert were awarded the Nobel Prize in physics for independently proposing a theory for the Higgs boson. That theory, initially rejected in the 1960s, led the high-energy physics community on a decades-long quest to find the particle that gives mass to matter.

While this discovery has been largely credited to CERN in Europe, America has been a leading force in the fundamental science that made identifying the Higgs possible.

Hundreds of scientists from my district are working actively on experiments at CERN. They played a leadership role building the Large Hadron Collider. We should all congratulate these scientists for advancing the basic understanding of our universe necessary for forging ahead into the next great frontier.

America is made great by our leadership in discovery sciences, so let's show them the support necessary to continue and expand our own science ecosystem.

IT IS TIME TO END THIS DESTRUCTIVE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. CARNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is time to end this destructive government shutdown. It just doesn't make any sense, and it's hurting people, and it's hurting the economy.

While Congress is wasting time on the shutdown, we have important work to do. We need to reform our housing finance system.

Right now, the Federal Government backs over 90 percent of all mortgages being made. That's just not sustainable. We have to bring private capital back into the markets, and we have to

reduce the government's role, but we have to do it in a smart way.

For generations, owning a home has been part of the American Dream. The 30-year fixed-rate mortgage has made that dream possible for many of us, and so our number one priority in reforming our housing finance system should be preserving the 30-year fixed-rate mortgage.

But the legislation currently moving through the House doesn't do that. That's why we need to work together on both sides of the aisle to fix that problem.

We need to reform our housing finance system and protect taxpayers, but we also must preserve home ownership for millions of American families.

LET'S WORK TOGETHER TO ADDRESS OUR DIFFERENCES

(Mr. STIVERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues in the House and the Senate today to work together to address our differences to fix this government shutdown.

The House has started by unanimously passing a bill that will pay furloughed Federal workers back pay. We've also passed bills that will fund lifesaving research, Head Start, veterans, and many other important parts of the government.

While some people have called this a piecemeal approach, those people ignore the fact that that's how our appropriations process has worked for over 230 years, with multiple appropriations bills every year. That is the real normal.

Mr. Speaker, let's tone down the rhetoric and work together and get our government funded and pay our debts.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN STOPS MILITARY DEATH BENEFIT

(Ms. CASTOR of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the harsh impacts of the Republican government shutdown is the fact that military families of our fallen heroes will no longer receive survivor benefits. They have been suspended.

Meanwhile, on Sunday, 8,000 miles away in Afghanistan, four Army Rangers were killed and 30 others were wounded by a suicide bomber and an IED. That's why I urge the approval today of legislation on the floor to provide the death benefits to our fallen soldiers.

But I'd also like to salute a Tampa, Florida, foundation, the Special Operations Warrior Foundation, that has stepped forward to fill the void and will provide four very generous grants to the families of our brave soldiers killed in action.

They typically provide scholarships and financial aid and counseling to the families of Special Operations soldiers, and I'd like to thank them: Retired Air Force Major Steve McLeary, Retired General Doug Brown, Retired Vice Admiral Joe Maguire, Melinda Scofield and Dahlia Munoz, and the entire board of directors, and the greater community of the Tampa Bay area that supports Special Operations Command and all of our brave heroes.

STOP EXAGGERATING AND FEARMONGERING

(Mr. MULVANEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, while we disagree from time to time, in fact, we agree more often than we probably disagree in this House. I think everybody can agree that one of the things we'd like to try and preserve is the concept of a reasoned debate. We want to have reasoned debate about the issues.

It is impossible to do that if folks start exaggerating and fearmongering, and that is exactly what is happening right now on the discussion of the debt ceiling. We hear that if we don't raise the debt ceiling, the world is going to end.

We've been trying to convince people for the last several weeks that the debt ceiling and the default are not linked in any fashion. Thankfully, just 15 minutes ago, somebody else came and agreed with me on this. It's Moody's, who says:

We believe the government would continue to pay interest and principal on its debt even in the event that the debt limit is not raised, leaving its creditworthiness intact. The debt limit restricts government expenditures to the amount of its incoming revenues; it does not prohibit the government from servicing its debt.

It goes on to say these two things are not linked. Let's have a reasonable discussion about the debt ceiling and the import of raising it and the import of running the government.

But let's stop trying to scare people and the markets into thinking that if we don't raise the debt ceiling that the Nation will default on its debt.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM IS LONG OVERDUE

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, comprehensive immigration reform is long overdue. The leadership the President, the Senate, and the Democrats in this body have shown has been tremendous.

Yes, we must provide a pathway to citizenship for the 11 million living in the shadows. Yes, we must provide the promise of the American Dream for the millions of youngsters brought here through no fault of their own; and, yes, we must ensure that this immigration

bill is a comprehensive immigration bill, open and accessible to all.

Diversity visas are one of the few ways and paths that those from Africa and the Caribbean have to become American citizens.

In many African countries, whole cities gather to hear the results of the diversity visa lottery. What's more, immigrants from Africa and the Caribbean typically are more educated, with the ability to contribute to our economy right away.

If we are going to have true comprehensive immigration reform, then we must keep the diversity visa lottery intact at its current levels because our diversity is what makes this Nation great.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SURVIVOR BENEFITS CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 91) making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military servicemembers of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 91

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for death gratuities and related benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided for fiscal year 2013 in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013 (division C of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for "Operation and Maintenance" and "Military Personnel" accounts for continuing the following projects and activities that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution or the Pay Our Military Act (Public Law 113-39), and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013:

(1) The payment of a death gratuity under sections 1475-1477 and 1489 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The payment or reimbursement for funeral and burial expenses authorized under sections 1481 and 1482 of title 10, United States Code.

(3) The payment or reimbursement of authorized funeral travel and travel related to the dignified transfer of remains and unit memorial services under section 481f of title 37, United States Code.

(4) The temporary continuation of a basic allowance of housing for dependents of members dying on active duty, as authorized by section 403(1) of title 37, United States Code.

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each program or activity shall be calculated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Department of Defense Survivor Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 91, the Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act.

Our government has no greater responsibility, Mr. Speaker, than to take care of the families of our brave men and women who have fought and died for our country. This bipartisan legislation provides continuing appropriations to ensure that, if troops are killed serving our country, our government will honor its obligations to them and their families without delay.

Specifically, the bill would provide for the payment of death gratuities and

other benefits, such as military housing allowances, to the families of our fallen soldiers. It would provide for authorized funeral and burial services for servicemembers and their families.

This measure would also pay for families to travel to meet the remains of their loved ones returning home. This bill provides appropriations to pay benefits upon the deaths of military servicemembers.

My colleagues, while this bill is written as a "continuing appropriations act," I want to be very clear. The intent of this legislation is to fully fund the specific benefits for all authorized recipients.

Mr. Speaker, we have a solemn duty to take care of our troops and their families, especially as we remain a Nation at war.

Our men and women serving in uniform, serving in dangerous places all over the globe, deserve the peace of mind of knowing that during the worst of times their families will receive the benefits they deserve immediately. This bill removes any ambiguity on this point.

This is a bipartisan bill with Democratic and Republican cosponsors that, I believe, should pass with overwhelming support.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, we are all looking for legislation upon which we can reach consensus. I am hopeful this bill will bring us together, and I urge support for it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, first of all, to thank Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN for bringing this legislation to the floor. I want to thank Chairman YOUNG of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and the subcommittee members for their work, and I certainly support the gentleman's legislation.

Unfortunately, the Department of Defense had to report that since October 1 of this year, 17 servicemembers have perished whose survivors would be entitled to a death gratuity payment. So the gentleman's legislation is correct in that it is timely, and it should pass.

The only other observation I would make at the beginning of the debate is the House passed the Pay Our Troops Act, H.R. 3210. I would hope that none of our colleagues are under the misimpression that we have solved all of our problems relative to our national defense because, in a comprehensive fashion, essentially, it deals with about 40 percent of the Department's budget.

The problem that Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN is attempting to address today is but a slice of that 60 percent that, unfortunately, the Government of the United States has not dealt with since the beginning of the fiscal year. But, again, I strongly support and thank the gentleman for his efforts.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, the Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act. This bill, as has been said, will ensure that the families of U.S. military members who have given the ultimate sacrifice will receive the benefits they were promised in spite of this unfortunate government shutdown.

The House has voted to take care of our warfighters by ensuring that they will be paid during the fiscal crisis, but our responsibility to our soldiers doesn't end there by any means.

As they put their lives on the line on behalf of this Nation, our brave soldiers shouldn't be concerned about who will take care of their families. That's part of our Nation's agreement with our men and women in uniform: You take care of the United States, and we will take care of you and your beloved family.

To this end, the bill allows continued funding to guarantee that the government honors its commitments to our military families without delay. It allows funding to provide a death gratuity to families of fallen soldiers. This is a lump payment to assist them in one of their greatest times of need.

The bill also allows for the customary financial assistance for funeral costs, family travel and housing, back salary payments, and living expenses. It's certainly the least we can do for those who make the ultimate sacrifice for our country.

The reality is we are a Nation at war. Wars don't stop just because our government is not functioning properly, nor do our obligations to our soldiers get put on pause while we work to clean things up.

To the families who have lost a son, a daughter, a sister, a brother, a husband, or a wife to war, this bill is our commitment to you that you should not have to suffer even more heartache after such a significant loss.

This legislation is the right thing to do. It should be passed without delay. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER).

Mr. BARBER. I thank the gentleman.

First of all, I want to thank Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY for taking up this critical legislation and for moving it so quickly to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, over the weekend, our Nation lost five patriots in Afghanistan. We need to remember who they were:

First Lieutenant Jennifer Moreno, U.S. Army;

Sergeant Joseph Peters, U.S. Army; Sergeant Patrick Hawkins, U.S. Army;

Private First Class Cody Patterson, U.S. Army;

Lance Corporal Jeremiah Collins, U.S. Marine Corps.

Thirty-six hours after they were killed, their families were notified that our government would not pay death benefits because of the government shutdown.

When I heard about this yesterday morning, I simply could not believe it was true. I asked my staff to look into the matter and find out if it could possibly be true. Unfortunately, they confirmed that indeed we had denied these benefits. We took immediate action, and along with a bipartisan group of Members representing the districts where these fallen heroes lived, we moved forward and introduced this legislation.

As has been said, the bill will provide funding to pay survivor benefits and cover the funeral costs for these military families and all servicemembers who may give the ultimate sacrifice during this shutdown of our government services.

God forbid that any other family should be put in this situation again. It is absolutely abhorrent that we would leave our military families without assistance when they are at their most vulnerable time of trying to deal with their loss and grief.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.J. Res. 91, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), a distinguished member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey in all matters related to national security, as well as the leadership of the gentleman from Indiana.

I also appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey's bringing this measure to the floor. It's rather unfortunate and somewhat amazing to me, actually, that he has to.

The Pay Our Military Act passed the House on September 29, passed the Senate, and was signed by the President the next day. It says clearly that there are hereby appropriated such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces.

Who would have ever thought that some lawyer in the Pentagon would say that the death and other benefits we are talking about today would not be included in that? Rather than spend

more time in squabbles with lawyers, I think the gentleman from New Jersey wisely has brought this measure to the floor just to make it clear so everybody understands that all of these allowances should be paid.

I think it's also, Mr. Speaker, very important for all of us to say that our hearts grieve with the families for whom this benefit is immediately relevant. Money alone, of course, cannot express our gratitude for the sacrifice and the service that their loved ones have given to this country. But it is important, even in these times when we have differences on fiscal and other issues, that the House come together and everybody unites, regardless of our opinions about other targeted funding issues, to say that we will stand with those families who have given so much to our Nation.

So, again, I commend the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing this, and I hope that all of my colleagues will vote in support of this measure.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans made a purely political choice to shut down our government to advance their agenda.

Unbelievably, House Republicans decided to shut down our government with thousands of American servicemen and -women on the battlefields in Afghanistan. We are here today because brave Americans who gave their lives on the battlefield were being denied funeral benefits because of this shutdown. Their families were being denied payments of survivor benefits.

This is a disgrace and a shameful consequence of the irresponsible Republican majority. This is an outrage.

The fact that we are here today to pass this bill is a clear admission that America's fallen heroes have been abandoned in this shameless political game being played.

Passing this bill is absolutely needed, but this bill requires us to recognize the willful failure of the Republican leadership in this House to fund our Federal Government and to provide our servicemen and -women all that they need.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey and all of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee who are bringing this up so quickly and for fast-tracking it.

Mr. Speaker, I was in the Marine Corps. I did three tours: two in Iraq, one in Afghanistan. I served with these men and women. I have met their wives, their husbands, their kids, their families. I sat down with them. I've had dinner with them. I want to say from the bottom of my heart, I apologize for the shameful act of the administration's lawyers in determining that

what we passed last month does not count for paying this death benefit.

When the lawyers in the administration made the decision to not count the death benefit, they broke a sacred trust with our U.S. military men and women and those on the front lines. It is up to us in this Congress to restore that trust for the American people and for our military that we have sent to war for whom we have a responsibility.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER).

Mr. BARBER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say the denial of this benefit is absolutely outrageous, and it is a disgrace. We've broken our fundamental promise to fallen heroes, and we must fix it. This bill will do just that.

We must also ensure that it never happens again. That's why, later today, I will be introducing a bill that makes sure we never forsake our fallen servicemembers or any member of our uniformed services ever again under these circumstances.

I am very pleased that we came together today in a bipartisan fashion. I thank my colleagues for coming together and for putting their differences aside in order to honor these commitments to those who have fallen and in order to take care of their families in this time of need. I hope we will see a unanimous vote in approving this bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN. I am very grateful that my oldest son's in-laws are ably served in New Jersey by Congressman RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today to express my shock at the administration's absolutely disgusting failure to keep faith with those who paid the ultimate price in the service of our country.

Today, four of our fallen have arrived at Dover Air Force Base, and the families in attendance will have had to pay their own way to be there for the arrival of their loved ones. This is a disgrace and an intentional policy to cause pain by this administration, whose actions are disrespectful of those who have made our freedoms possible.

Soon, we will vote to restate the critical death gratuities that we owe in no uncertain terms to the families of our fallen servicemembers to correct the injustice that has been thrust upon them.

I am particularly disappointed in the administration, as the son of a veteran, as a 31-year veteran myself, and as a grateful father of four sons currently serving in the military.

This Congress, in a bipartisan way, passed the Pay Our Military Act. It was signed into law for the express purpose of making sure that those who served in our Armed Forces in the de-

fense of our freedom are paid all that they are owed. The administration already has the authority to pay this gratuity.

Every effort should be made to respect our servicemembers and military families. The administration is playing politics on the backs of the families of our fallen. This is unconscionable.

Today's vote will give us an opportunity to do our duty to take care of the families of our fallen servicemembers. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this bill.

□ 1300

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I rise in enthusiastic support of H.J. Res. 91, and I thank the ranking member and the chairman for recognizing that all Members—all Members—had a pain in their heart regarding those mothers and fathers who are now suffering the loss of their children, four young men and one young woman, to my recollection, names that we should never forget because we are a Nation at war. For that reason, I believe that this was of great concern to the administration and Secretary Hagel. They're in a dilemma, a conflict, if you will, on the present shutdown of the government.

But I would say to the chairman and ranking member, this is what Congress is all about, fixing the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I will place into the RECORD my letter to Secretary Hagel asking for relief for these families. Now we have it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. If I might just inquire, a question of the Chair on H.J. Res. 91: Would you accept a unanimous consent request to ask that every Member of the House be considered an original sponsor or cosponsor of this legislation, H.J. Res. 91?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's request cannot be entertained. There is a proper procedure for adding cosponsors.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I make that request now.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 8, 2013.

Hon. CHUCK HAGEL,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY HAGEL: Let me express my appreciation for your service to our nation and for the sacrifices being made by men and women in uniform serving far from home to keep America safe.

As you may be aware, this past weekend five members of the Armed Forces fell in battle while serving in Afghanistan. All Americans mourn their loss and extend our condolences to their families.

I am particularly disturbed to learn that death benefits have been withheld from the families of the fallen due to the government shutdown.

I am therefore requesting that you review H.R. 3210, the "Pay Our Military Act," which the President signed into law as Pub. L. 113-039 on September 30, 2013, and direct that death benefits be paid to the families immediately so that they can travel to Dover Air Force Base and defray the cost of funeral expenses for these fallen heroes.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I know how important the work done by our men and women in uniform serving abroad is to the mission of keeping the homeland secure. I know also that your commitment to our men and women in uniform is unparalleled.

Thank you for your reconsideration. Please contact me if I can be of further assistance.

Very Truly Yours,

SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, four brave United States servicemembers died in service to our Nation. Like too many before, Lieutenant Jennifer Moreno, Sergeant Hawkins, Sergeant Joseph Peters, and Private First Class Cody Patterson were killed—far from home—by an improvised explosive device in the remote Kandahar province of Afghanistan.

Now, due to the government shutdown, their families have not been disbursed the standard survivor benefits from the United States military that they are rightfully owed. These benefits include reimbursement to the family for funeral expenses, payment of survivor housing, reimbursement for funeral travel, travel associated with dignified transfer of the remains, and other expenses.

This is, beyond a doubt, an outrage. Two of the fallen, Sergeant Hawkins and Private Patterson, were based in my district at Fort Benning, Georgia. Both soldiers were members of the Army's prestigious 75th Ranger Regiment. Sergeant Hawkins was serving his fourth deployment to Afghanistan and Private Patterson his second.

Imagine the pain these families are going through in coping with the death of a loved one. Now imagine being greeted with the cold shoulder of a shuttered government, their country turning on them all because of an unnecessary shutdown.

How dare we not provide these grieving families with the necessary support in their time of need. I am truly embarrassed that these shutdown shenanigans have impacted these brave soldiers' families in this way.

To those people who say the government shutdown is only of minimal impact, remember these families. This is not minimal. These are our sons and daughters we have sent to combat in faraway lands, and they should never have to question our Nation's resolve in taking care of their families. We

must reopen our government so that such inconveniences do not continue to plague our Nation.

In the meantime, let's pass this bill, H.J. Res. 91, for our Nation's military families.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, without question, every Member of the House should support providing a death gratuity for family members following the death of service personnel.

The majority is once again proposing an approach that addresses today's problem but leaves the overarching crisis before us unresolved. Major gaps in capabilities remain with neither a fully functioning national defense nor a fully functioning Federal Government.

The Republican shutdown and piecemeal plan is damaging to the Department of Defense: it hurts our credibility with our allies; reports from the Asian-Pacific Economic Forum suggest that the shutdown raises questions about U.S. political stability and plays into Chinese and Russian foreign policy objectives; and the Army Chief of Staff has said the shutdown is harming readiness.

Even if Republicans' irresponsible piecemeal bills were enacted, at the rate they are going, it would take until after Christmas before the government is fully up and running.

We could end the shutdown today if Republican leadership would allow a vote. Democrats have negotiated. We didn't just meet in the middle; in fact, we agreed to the Republican spending level in the stopgap bill.

How many more times will the majority discover an unintended consequence before they come to their senses and allow a vote to end the reckless Republican shutdown?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. If I could ask my friend how many more speakers he has on his side.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We anticipate, through the Chair, several more speakers; but I assume we are both waiting, perhaps, for some additional.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. That is what both of us are doing, and we can continue talking to each other.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be happy to.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say to the gentleman that I want to salute you and Chairman YOUNG for sponsoring this legislation, which is truly bipartisan, for bringing it to the floor and for giving Members of both parties an opportunity to join together. At a time when there is a lot of disjointment around here and lack of consensus, on this there is no argument at all; and I am highly appreciative of all that you have done to assist in this process?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I appreciate the gentleman's remark about our chairman, Mr. YOUNG, who has announced his retirement at the end of this Congress. You could find no finer person in the world—a kinder heart or wanting to leave the world better—than our chairman.

I would use this time while we are waiting to simply follow on Chairman ROGERS' remark in reminding all of our colleagues that we do continue to be a Nation at war, and while we have lost 17 individuals since October 1, in fact, this Nation has lost 117 people since the beginning of this year.

I do hope, as we proceed with the United States Congress and the administration, people understand that we ought to fully fund not just the Department of Defense for their important job, but the other agencies of this government, and certainly through the regular appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, our government has no greater responsibility than to take care of the families of our brave men and women who have fought and died for our country. This legislation will ensure, as we've said earlier in this discussion, without question and any ambiguity, that the Department of Defense should provide payment of death gratuities and other benefits to families of our fallen men and women in uniform.

I urge support for this bipartisan legislation, and I thank Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY for their leadership in making sure this bill gets to the President as quickly as possible.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 91. Yesterday the Department of Defense issued a press release saying the Pentagon does not have the authority to pay death gratuities for the survivors of service members killed in action. This is beyond unacceptable.

Prior to the end of the fiscal year this body passed the Pay Our Military Act, giving the Secretary of Defense plenty of latitude on prioritizing military pay and allowances to Service Members.

This act was understood to provide for death benefits to families of fallen troops during the government shutdown.

I add my voice to the cacophony of frustrated colleagues in disbelief. We are flabbergasted that the Death Gratuity, which provides surviving family members \$100,000 in death benefits, was not brought to our attention sooner.

Our office received a phone call from a constituent yesterday who was enraged that military families were no longer receiving these benefits.

Having deployed as a chaplain in the Air Force Reserves, I have been in those life altering situations where the loss of life uproots a family's sense of normalcy.

The immediate days after learning of a service member's death are critical for a bereaving

family. Knowing the cost of burial and other after life care is provided for makes the situation a little more bearable.

I plead with this Congress to not turn this issue into one of our normal political footballs where we punt the issue from one body to the next. Let us decide now to take care of our citizens who have offered up their sons and daughters, husbands and wives to the defense of our Nation.

Today this body will choose the moral imperative and tell the families who have lost it all, your cries are being heard and your broken hearts have moved our Chamber into action.

I implore the House with the strongest conviction I possess to move on this legislation and return military families back to focus on rebuilding their lives.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in strong support of H.J. Res. 91 the Department of Defense Survivor Benefits Continuing Appropriations Resolution for 2014.

The Federal Government functions as a cohesive unit, not as dismembered parts. The Federal Departments, sub agencies, independent agencies, commissions, and offices interact with each other much like a military unit serving in the field.

They have relationships that are not apparent until they are revealed most often when a critical need for the Federal Government function is not present when another agency or most important when someone needs that service.

I along with fellow members of the United States House of Representatives stand together to honor and recognize the sacrifice of Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins, First Lieutenant Jennifer M. Moreno, Sergeant Joseph M. Peters, Private First Class Cody J. Patterson, and Lance Corporal Jeremiah who lost their lives in defense of this nation and pray for their families that they find solace, grace and mercy.

We made a promise to them and to their families to support them when deployed, and take care of their families at home so they can serve without fear or concern for the wellbeing of their loved ones.

We also promised all of our men and women in the armed services that should the unthinkable happen and their lives are lost in the service of this nation we will step in and be there for their families.

This promise is one that the House and the President take very seriously, but the business of politics is intervening in our discharge of the most basic function of Congress to fund the entire Federal Government.

Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins, First Lieutenant Jennifer M. Moreno, Sergeant Joseph M. Peters, Private First Class Cody J. Patterson, and Lance Corporal Jeremiah did not forget their duty nor ignore the obligations to keep the oath they took to protect this nation from all enemies both foreign and domestic.

The majority has to put the nation's interest ahead of their political interest—the ideological, social or cultural values that you embrace cannot supersede the needs of our nation. Congress' insistence on funding some parts of the Federal government, while intentionally not funding others is causing confusion and doubt about what can and cannot be funded.

This is understandable since the Federal funding process has never occurred in this way.

Members of the House of Representatives know how serious Congress takes Federal employees coloring outside of the lines when it comes to Congressional legislative intent when they carry out their work. We do not ask Federal employees to be creative with the purse strings of the government, but the mini-CR process is creating confusion and uncertainty on how Federal employees working with a mini-CR, reduced staff and under Sequestration determine how to proceed within the law.

Appropriations bills can be hundreds of pages long depending on the size of the agency. When the House of Representatives insisted on closing the entire Federal government, then decides to engage in this absurd process of mini-continuing resolution, they knew we were moving Federal employees into uncharted waters.

There will be other surprises regarding what agency is needed to provide a service to a group or another part of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the House majority has this Nation stumbling around a dark room looking for a way out, but we know how to escape this drama. The flashlight that can lead us out of this darkness is the passage of the Senate's clean CR.

I pay tribute to these American heroes:

Sergeant Patrick C. Hawkins, 25, of Carlisle, Pennsylvania, assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, Fort Benning, Georgia. In 2010, he enlisted into the Army following his high school graduation.

He has been posthumously awarded the Bronze Star Medal, Meritorious Service Medal and Purple Heart. Sergeant Hawkins has been awarded the Joint Service Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal with two Campaign Stars, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, the NATO Medal, and the Presidential Unit Citation.

Sergeant Hawkins was described by fellow service persons as "a brave and incredibly talented Ranger." It is reported that he was killed while going to the aid of a fallen fellow soldier. The Ranger Creed: I will never leave a fallen comrade, is part of the values held by soldiers—they put others before themselves and in doing so assure success of their missions.

First Lieutenant Jennifer M. Moreno, 25, of San Diego, California, assigned to Madigan Army Medical Center, Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Washington. First Lieutenant Moreno volunteered to be a member of a cultural support team that joined efforts with a special operations task force serving in Afghanistan.

She grew up in Logan Heights with her mother, two sisters and a brother who is also in the Army.

Sergeant Joseph M. Peters, 24, of Springfield, Missouri, assigned to the 5th Military Police Battalion, Vicenza, Italy. It is reported that the Army's Criminal Investigation Command (CID) said that Sergeant Joseph M. Peters was assigned to one of their Special Operations units. Sergeant Peters investigated felony level crimes involving the Army. Peters was the first special agent for CID to be killed in Iraq or Afghanistan.

Private First Class Cody J. Patterson, 24, of Philomath, Oregon, assigned to the 3rd Bat-

talion, 75th Ranger Regiment, at Fort Benning, Georgia. This was his second deployment to Afghanistan. He was described as:

... courageous and dedicated and lost his life while fighting tenaciously against our nation's enemies alongside his fellow Rangers. Our thoughts and prayers are with the Patterson family.

Lance Corporal Jeremiah, 19, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, assigned to Combat Logistics Regiment 2, 2nd Marine Logistics Group, II Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

We offer our heartfelt sympathy to the families and fellow soldiers of those who died.

Mr. Speaker I ask that my Colleagues work together to end this impasse so that we can have a whole and completely functioning Federal government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 91.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 373, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) making continuing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 90

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the Federal Aviation Administration for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (division F of Public Law 113-6) and under the authority and conditions provided in such Act, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution, that were conducted in fiscal year 2013, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available by such Act under the heading "Department of Transportation—Federal Aviation Administration".

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) for each account shall be cal-

culated to reflect the full amount of any reduction required in fiscal year 2013 pursuant to—

(1) any provision of division G of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), including section 3004; and

(2) the Presidential sequestration order dated March 1, 2013, except as attributable to budget authority made available by the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-2).

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2014 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 15, 2013.

SEC. 104. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 105. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 106. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2013, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 107. It is the sense of Congress that this joint resolution may also be referred to as the "Flight Safety Act".

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Federal Aviation Administration Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.J. Res. 90, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I present H.J. Res. 90, a bill providing the FAA with critical funding to ensure safe air travel for the American public and providing critical support for the aviation industry, our Nation's leading exporter.

This bill funds the FAA at the current fiscal year 2013 sequester level through December 15 or until enactment of a full-year appropriation for the Transportation-HUD bill, whichever comes first.

The bill would bring back over 6,000 aviation safety inspectors who are currently not working due to the shutdown. These safety inspectors perform critical aircraft certifications that support American jobs by certifying new aircraft for sale in the U.S. and abroad.

The FAA's aviation safety workforce is also essential to ensuring safety in the national airspace by reinspecting and recertifying the operation aircraft fleets that transport millions of Americans every day.

The bill would also reopen the aircraft registry service, assuring that American-made aircraft can move off the production lines and onto the markets in the U.S. and around the world.

The bill would reopen the FAA Academy to resume the training of new air traffic controllers and ensure that our air traffic controller workforce is fully staffed.

The bill will ensure that air traffic control modernization investments resume, ensuring that our NextGen development and deployment continues on schedule.

This is not a comprehensive FY 2014 bill but, rather, a CR to continue funding the FAA at the current fiscal year 2013 sequester levels. This brings the FAA back to work to ensure the safety of the flying public until we can come to an overall resolution on the FY 2014 funding levels.

I urge the quick passage of this important legislation so that we can send it on to the Senate. Let's get the FAA back to work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 1315

Here we go again. This week, the House has considered bill after bill to fund pieces of the Federal Government. We can open the entire government if the House would simply pass the clean continuing resolution passed by the Senate nearly 2 weeks ago. Instead, we are considering a bill to fund the Federal Aviation Administration, but we are leaving many other agencies within the Department of Transportation in shutdown status.

I strongly support the mission of the FAA. The controllers, technicians, and safety inspectors are highly skilled and dedicated public servants. However, I cannot support this piecemeal approach to funding our transportation system.

For example, 94 percent of the Federal Transit Administration's employees are furloughed. More than 1,300 transit agencies across the country are not receiving grants for capital and operating assistance. No funds are provided for the Capital Investment Grant Program, which helps create construction jobs and relieves congestion in our major cities.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's vehicle safety program is shut down. Defects in cars and trucks are not being investigated. Crash tests and safety rulemakings have been suspended.

What about assistance for Amtrak? Operating and capital assistance is discontinued at a time when more than 30 million passengers rely on Amtrak to get to destinations all over this country.

The Maritime Security Program gets no relief in this piecemeal approach. This program provides vital support by helping move the cargo that is necessary to support our national defense efforts overseas.

Finally, the National Transportation Safety Board has furloughed most of its employees. Investigations into last week's tragic bus crash in Tennessee will go undone. Today, we reported a gas explosion in Oklahoma, which would be the responsibility of this agency to investigate. Will it be investigated? Probably not—only because of the shutdown.

The reckless and irresponsible shutdown that has been masterminded by a small faction of the House is disruptive for our Nation's transportation system and for the programs that support our most vulnerable citizens.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for opposition to this piecemeal approach to this piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard from the other side of the aisle on all of these bills that attempt to reopen many aspects of the Federal Government. We hear them say, well, I am in favor of that program, but I want to vote against it until they bring the entire government funding bill before us.

I would love to do that. I would love to bring the entire budget here. In fact, we did, and we can't get the Senate to act on it. But in the meantime, the other side is saying, I will vote against this because I want to save and vote for the entire Federal Government.

That may work in some of the agencies, but this is safety. This is the safety of people flying the skies of this country and the world. You don't want to delay safety until you can vote on a bigger bill. I think it is irresponsible not to support the safety of our people in the skies.

This bill provides funding to resume operations within FAA that are critical to the safety of our skies and our aircraft fleet. It would bring back 7,000 aviation safety inspectors currently not working, restart aircraft certification activities, resume training for air traffic controllers, reopen the aircraft registry service, and continue air traffic control modernization.

Mr. Speaker, you don't want to mess around with the safety of our people. This bill cures that problem. I can't imagine anyone wanting to oppose this bill.

The sum total of these efforts will help guarantee safe, efficient, and reliable air travel for the American public.

This funding is provided at an annual rate of \$12 billion and will last until December 15, or until the Congress enacts and the President signs full-year appropriations bills.

The language in this bill is yet again nearly identical to what was included in the CR I offered back in September—nearly a month ago.

Once again, we are calling on the Senate to consider and pass this bill. Our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol continue to call for a clean CR; yet they continue to act on these "clean" mini-CRs.

The House has put forward a plethora of options to fund the Federal Government: first, the four annual appropriations bills to fund the government in regular order; then three different continuing resolutions prior to September 30; and now the short-term CRs to reopen parts of the Federal Government—in fact, more than a third of it so far.

But the Senate is committed to inaction. They didn't pass any regular appropriations bills; they will not pass our clean, short-term funding bills; and they so far have refused to join us at the negotiating table.

Mr. Speaker, that completely puzzles me. It goes against the grain of what has gone on in this country since we have been a country. When the two bodies differ, the Founding Fathers said, if you can't agree, appoint conference members from either body—both bodies—and let them go out and recommend a solution to the problem. It has always worked, except now the Senate refuses to do their duty.

I hope they will consider this bill as a steppingstone toward ending the shutdown. We need to come together in a productive way with open ears and open minds to find a way to clean up this mess.

I urge my colleagues to preserve the safety of American skies. Vote for this bill.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting in that I believe many months ago the Senate, which no one thought would pass a budget, we persuaded them through our votes here in the House to pass a budget, and the House leadership refused to have a conference to appoint conferees so that we could have had regular order, had done

the appropriations bills—and I know the chairman of Appropriations wanted to do that—and today here we are talking about safety when most of the air traffic controllers are already on the job.

I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this reckless Republican shutdown.

As if we need any more proof of a broken Republican government funding strategy, today we are considering a fix to a sequester Band-Aid. This is déjà vu, Mr. Speaker, and further admission that the Republican budget strategy just is not working. While this bill puts furloughed FAA workers back on the job, it does nothing for the rest of our transportation system. This shutdown affects our transit, vehicle safety, railroad, pipeline and hazardous materials, and maritime programs, too.

For example, at the Federal Transit Administration, 94 percent of the employees have been furloughed. No grants are being issued to more than 1,300 transit agencies around the country. Additionally, at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, vehicle safety activities, like consumer testing of new vehicles and investigations to identify defects in automobiles, have been suspended.

Now, all of these points aren't to say that Democrats have no desire to avoid flight delays and cancellations because of furloughed controllers. Earlier this year, despite our opposition to the broader FY '14 T-HUD bill, we supported the inclusion of language to prevent controller furloughs. Unfortunately, that effort never advanced because the allocation for the T-HUD bill under the Republican budget forced cuts so deep to very important popular initiatives like the Community Development Block Grant and Amtrak programs that not even Republicans could support the broader bill, and it was Republicans that pulled the bill from the House floor.

We could end FAA furloughs and all other furloughs if the Speaker allowed a vote on the clean CR to end the shutdown. Democrats have negotiated. Let's remember that. We didn't just meet in the middle; we agreed to the Republican spending level in the stop-gap bill. Look no further than a recent headline from the National Journal yesterday: "Nineteen times Democrats tried to negotiate with Republicans. The GOP's biggest talking point of the shutdown is only true if you ignore everything that has happened before last week."

I want to make one other point. I woke up this morning listening to the voice of a furloughed worker with two kids in college who was talking about how in the world he is going to pay his expenses and put food on the table without the dollars that he and his wife count on in their accounts.

Let's look at the facts. Let's listen to these stories in our districts. It is fine to be so cavalier here in Washington and shut down the government, talking about getting rid of our important obligation to pay our debts, but let's look at the impact of this. Let's look at what is happening back home in our districts and think of how critical these workers are, these programs are.

Let's get the bill on the floor that would fund the entire government. This piecemeal effort may sound good. I don't know if it sounds good to your constituents. I don't know if you can fool them that way, but let's put the entire bill on the floor that was at your level that passed the Senate and let's move forward.

Vote "no" on this irresponsible bill, and demand a House vote to immediately end the reckless Republican shutdown.

Mr. LATHAM. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this bill to fully fund the FAA, the Federal Aviation Administration. It is so absolutely critical, both to our economy as well as to our security in the airways, not only on commercial flights but general aviation as well.

Mr. Speaker, during this shutdown, we keep hearing a lot about ObamaCare, but this bill has nothing to do with ObamaCare. It has no strings attached. It just funds the FAA.

I know that many of our colleagues on the other side will say, well, they can't vote for this unless they have an entire clean CR funding the entire government, because they want exactly what they want, and nothing else will do. Yet, they call Republicans "absolutists."

Fortunately, many on the other side will support this bill. In fact, I think it is of note that with all the various CRs, clean CRs, that we have been passing since this shutdown began, all with no strings attached, all that have nothing to do with ObamaCare, we actually now have funded a large part—if not more than half—of the entire discretionary Federal budget.

Unfortunately, the President and the Senate Majority Leader keep saying that they will not negotiate; they won't consider any of these things.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important funding bill.

□ 1330

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), the ranking member of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Aviation Subcommittee, I know how

important it is to end the shutdown of the FAA, but I do have to ask the question, if safety were so important, why wasn't this the first bill brought to the floor in this piecemeal approach that the Republican side has taken?

Now, look. A safe and efficient aviation system isn't just good for travelers; it's the lifeblood of the economy where I come from. In our State, 131,000 people across over 1,200 companies work in the aerospace industry, but these folks don't just depend on the FAA. Is it safety to say that police departments that need Federal grants to put cops on the beat should have to wait? Is it safety to say that our functioning transit systems have to wait for grants to make the transit systems more safe? Is it safety to say that the EPA can't issue grants in my district or around the country to make sure that we have safe and clean drinking water? This bill funds none of these priorities.

We should not be opening just parts of the government to serve just some of the people. We should open the entire government for all Americans. The Republican solution to the Republican shutdown, this piecemeal approach picking winners and picking losers, is no solution at all.

It's great that this House wants to make sure that air travel is safe, but why should we stop there? What about safety on our highways?

In the last 10 days, there have been three major, fatal transportation accidents across this country. A plane crashed in Santa Monica, California, killing four; a bus crashed in Tennessee, killing eight and injuring another 14; and less than a mile from this building, one person died and two others were injured during a Metro repair accident this week. But the National Transportation Safety Board can't investigate because this Congress sent the investigators home on furlough.

Let's end this piecemeal approach and move on to a vote on a Senate bill that opens all of the government for all Americans. If it's about safety, let's do it that way. This continued unwillingness to allow one vote—just one vote—to open the government for all Americans and not just some needs to stop. One bill, one vote for all Americans.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. I thank the chairman for bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it troubles me that the administration is once again going out of its way to cause pain for the American people and at great risk to America's safety. We see this up close and personal in my district with this incomprehensible closure of the FAA registry office. That is the office that allows air flights to be transferred, to be sold and bought and purchased and entered into service. In previous shutdowns, this office was deemed essential. It was kept open and for good reason. It is the equivalent of DMV for

aircraft; you have to keep this pipeline moving. It is important for safety and for workers. It is affecting thousands of families all across the country who build these airplanes—engineers and workers and manufacturers and sheet metal benders—especially in the Fourth District, the air capital of the world.

There are thousands of families, many of them hardworking union families folks across the aisle tell me they care deeply about, and I know that I do, too. I would urge these folks on the other side of the aisle to recognize the importance to our labor force, to keep America safe, to get the aircraft registry back open, and to pass this legislation on the floor today.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today in support of H.J. Res. 90, the Flight Safety Act. This commonsense bill will restore critical funding to the FAA and help protect airports in northern Michigan and throughout our Nation.

Like so many people in our country, I am deeply frustrated by this government shutdown. I don't want to see air travelers in northern Michigan hurt because the Senate and the President refuse to negotiate on a spending plan. All that needs to be done is for both sides to come to the negotiating table, but the Senate refuses to talk to us. It's ridiculous.

We've already seen this mess in Washington impact airports in my district, like the Cherry Capital Airport in Traverse City. Just this past weekend, dozens of flights were canceled because of this government shutdown. Families shouldn't be stranded at the airport for hours just because Washington can't get its act together. But it doesn't have to be this way. We could fix this problem at our airports right now with this simple piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Flight Safety Act today. I also urge our colleagues in the Senate to take action and pass this measure as soon as possible.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleague that we could fund the entire government if my colleague could persuade his leadership to bring H.J. Res. 59 to the floor. We could have a straight up-or-down vote. It would probably pass in a bipartisan manner, and we could stop the shutdown, and people could go back to work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it's interesting that we've talked about bringing our em-

ployees back from the shutdown. We were told by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that this is very important because here we are dealing with safety, and the reality is that probably the majority of the air traffic controllers and safety personnel, as required by FAA, are working. I can't imagine that the administrator, Mr. Huerta, would put the American public in any kind of danger.

Again, if we would have had a budget conference several months ago, we could have done the appropriations process and probably funded the entire government using regular order, but I keep hearing that if this vote were to come to the floor that it would pass in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take H.J. Res. 59 from the table and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona. Well, Mr. Speaker, next time I bring it up, I will try to clear it since there is such enthusiasm to bring the Federal Government back to work.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about H.J. Res. 90, the so-called "Flight Safety Act," which provides limited and insufficient funding for the Federal Aviation Administration, and is test gimmick of the Tea Party dominated Republican majority to extricate themselves from the fiasco they created when they voted to shut down the government.

I am a senior member of the Homeland Security. I chaired the Transportation Security Subcommittee in the 111th Congress and was its Ranking Member in the last Congress. I represent Houston, which is home to one of the nation's busiest and most important airports. So I know the importance of the air transit industry to our economy. And I know that the health of the air transit industry depends upon security of air travel. I support robust funding for the FAA. I support robust funding for TSA. I support and worked to secure increased funding to modernize airport runways, reduce noise, increase the number of air marshals, and to develop NextGen.

NextGen is the name given to the new air-space system to be phased in between 2012 and 2025. NextGen will transform America's air traffic control system from an aging ground-based system to a satellite-based system that shortened routes, save time and fuel, reduce traffic delays, increase capacity, and permit controllers to monitor and manage aircraft with greater safety margins. So while I take a back seat to no one in my support for a modern and secure air transportation system, the bill before us is the wrong way for this House to deal with the pressing budgetary priorities of the nation.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon our Republican colleagues to abandon their current strategy of wasting valuable floor time bring miniCRs to the floor. They know the Senate will not accept them and the President will veto them. This strategy will not reopen the government they voted to shut down.

There are the votes in this House to pass the clean CR from the Senate and send it to the President today. That will reopen the government today. And that is what we should do. Every day we delay passing a clean CR is another day of unnecessary pain and hardship and burden inflicted on the American people.

People like Ramon Encarnacion of Texas, whose 11-year-old son doesn't understand why his father, an FAA aviation safety inspector, was able to greet him when he got home from school this week. "When he came home and saw me here and not working, Mr. Encarnacion said 'But you're always at work.'" Mr. Encarnacion worked for 25 years at American Airlines without ever being furloughed and he never thought he would be out of work when he took a job at the Federal Aviation Administration as a safety inspector last year. But with the government shutdown, Mr. Encarnacion and hundreds of other Texas employees who work for the FAA are getting an unplanned and unpaid leave of absence.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more to the nation's transportation system and infrastructure than the small portion of FAA safety inspectors funded by this piece-meal mini-CR.

The shutdown of the government has crippled many of the safety enforcement and grant-making functions of the Federal Transit Administration, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Federal Railroad Administration, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and the National Transportation Safety Board.

This mini-CR does not end the adverse effects that the government shutdown has had on other transportation safety and infrastructure investments. As long as House Republicans abandon their shutdown strategy: The Federal Transit Administration cannot process or award operating and capital grants to roughly 1,300 transit agencies.

The FTA cannot fund or review major transit capital projects which create construction jobs and relieve congested areas. And FTA cannot implement its authorized safety oversight responsibilities provided in MAP-21. FTA cannot perform these critical functions because more than 9 in 10 (94 percent) of its employees have been furloughed.

There are no funds in this mini-CR for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration so the agency has had to: Suspend investigations into safety defects in vehicles; halt all vehicle safety enforcement, research, data analysis, and consumer testing programs; Delay compliance testing of vehicles and equipment; and Defer safety research on crash avoidance technologies, occupant protection and alcohol detection.

Since there are no funds for the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration in this bill, the agency lacks funds to conduct pipeline and hazardous materials safety inspections or to award pipeline safety grants to state and local governments.

The National Transportation Safety Board has had to furlough 95 percent of employees and suspend investigations into new crashes and incidents.

The same is true for the Federal Railroad Administration, which has no funds for FRA safety inspectors and has furloughed more than half of its employees.

Mr. Speaker, the lack of funding for the Maritime Administration has resulted in the shutdown of the United States Merchant Marine Academy and a suspension of the Maritime Security Program, which ships cargo to support our national defense efforts overseas.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this mini-CR claims funds portions of the Transportation Security Administration but it provides no funds for commercial aviation screening or Federal Flight Deck Officer Training or Federal Air Marshals travel and training.

Democrats are and have been willing to negotiate over honest differences—but not before House Republican vote to open the government and remove the threat of government default.

Mr. Speaker, people are hurting. Our economy is suffering. The shutdown has cost our economy \$8.5 billion in lost productivity already and that number increases by \$1.5 billion everyday.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end the madness. Let the House vote today on H.J. Res. 59, as passed by the Senate and reopen our government and put our people back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 373, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the joint resolution?

Ms. ESTY. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Esty moves to recommit the joint resolution H.J. Res. 90 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That upon passage of this joint resolution by the House of Representatives, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 59) making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, as amended by the Senate on September 27, 2013, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table and the House shall be considered to have (1) receded from its amendment; and (2) concurred in the Senate amendment.

Ms. ESTY (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, this is the ninth day of the unnecessary government shutdown and the 12th time we've made a motion to bring a clean continuing resolution to the floor—12 times to allow this House to vote on a measure that has passed the Senate, 12 times to allow the House to vote on a budget figure that the Republicans asked for and that has already passed this House—a measure that, based on public statements by Members of this body, would pass and reopen the government immediately.

Across my district and across the country, workers have been furloughed, and veterans and seniors are seeing their earned benefits delayed. People in Connecticut and across America are suffering the consequences of this reckless, unnecessary shutdown in very real ways.

For months, groups in Connecticut that partner with NIH to conduct research that we need to find breakthrough treatments for children and adults with cancer have been asking that we end the budget sequester. Last week, university hospitals and researchers like those in my State came together to oppose the piecemeal approach, and they asked this House to end the government shutdown.

The shutdown means that loans for small businesses to help them grow and create jobs are being delayed. In fact, the average loans for small businesses approved per day in my district are \$188,000, and those businesses put those loans to work in creating jobs, ordering new equipment, exporting their goods, but they can't when the SBA is shut down.

Business travelers need the entire Federal budget reopened, not a gimmick piecemeal bill limited to parts of the FAA. Piecemeal gimmicks are not a solution for families and children who need the entire Federal Government reopened so that Head Start classrooms aren't closed. Piecemeal gimmicks are not a solution for our veterans who need the entire Federal Government reopened so that they don't face even more unnecessary, harmful delays for the benefits they have earned.

Tax-paying Americans are right to expect their hard-earned tax dollars are used responsibly. What sense does it make for taxpayers to be footing the bill for furloughed workers who are prohibited from working when we can vote today for this motion which would lead to the entire Federal Government's reopening?

Yesterday, I received a report that 801 unemployment claims have been filed in Connecticut from furloughed workers. Taxpayers will be paying unemployment instead of paying people to work. One vote is all it would take, and this motion could be that vote.

It's time to end the shutdown. It's time to send a short-term funding bill

to the President. It's time to reopen the entire Federal Government. It is time to be responsible. This is what I hear from folks across my district: Reopen the entire government. A manufacturer in my district let me know that the shutdown is causing uncertainty in its business and its customers' businesses. The shutdown has put a chilling effect on its customers and is harming confidence.

Piecemeal gimmicks are not the solution to this problem, and this disingenuous, piecemeal approach is not acceptable to the Chamber of Commerce or to a coalition of over 250 associations representing multiple private sector job-creating industries. They sent a letter to us even before the shutdown, urging this body to promptly pass a continuing resolution to fund the government and raise the debt ceiling. We need to reopen the Federal Government for all of the American people.

Make no mistake: I want the FAA reopened. I have contract towers in my district. I want the FAA reopened. I want the VA reopened. I want the entire Federal Government reopened. I ask my colleagues to be reasonable and to vote to pass this motion to reopen the entire Federal Government.

I will remind my colleagues who claim that we won't meet part way, we have. Mr. Speaker, the budget figure in this temporary spending bill is your proposal. The Republican budget number is much, much lower, frankly, than what Democrats prefer, but we want to end the shutdown and stop the pain for all of the American people. So we come before this House with the Republicans' own budget figure and ask all House Members to do the right thing. Join us. Join us in reopening the Federal Government. I urge all House Members to vote "aye" on this motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1345

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the instructions contained in the motion violate clause 7 of rule XVI, which requires that an amendment be germane to the bill under consideration.

As the Chair recently ruled on October 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8, 2013, the instructions contain a special order of business within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and, therefore, the amendment is not germane to the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from Connecticut wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, doesn't the bill before us fund a portion of the Federal Government?

My motion to recommit would open up the entire Federal Government so that all of the benefits taxpayers have paid for with their hard-earned dollars are available.

Can the Chair explain why it is not germane to open all of the Federal Government instead of just one portion of the government?

We have voted to pay workers furloughed during a shutdown—I supported that bill—but what sense does it make to have workers paid to sit at home and not able to do their jobs? What kind of a strange House is this that would force that situation on our workers and taxpayers?

Mr. Speaker, if you rule this motion out of order, does that mean we will not be opening the entire Federal Government today? Can the Chair please explain why we can't open the entire Federal Government today?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Iowa makes a point of order that the instructions proposed in the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut are not germane.

The joint resolution extends funding relating to the Federal Aviation Administration. The instructions in the motion propose an order of business of the House.

As the Chair ruled on October 2, October 3, October 4, October 7, and October 8, 2013, a motion to recommit proposing an order of business of the House is not germane to a measure providing for the appropriation of funds because such a motion addresses a matter within the jurisdiction of a committee not represented in the underlying measure.

Therefore, the instructions propose a non-germane amendment. The point of order is sustained.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of Rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the joint resolution, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 91.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 194, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

YEAS—228

Aderholt	Barletta	Bilirakis
Amash	Barr	Bishop (UT)
Amodei	Barton	Black
Bachmann	Benishek	Blackburn
Bachus	Bentivolio	Boustany

Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)	Hinojosa	McCollum	Sarbanes
Bridenstine	Heck (NV)	Radel	Holt	McDermott	Schakowsky
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Reed	Honda	McGovern	Schiff
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Reichert	Horsford	McIntyre	Schneider
Broun (GA)	Hudson	Renacci	Hoyer	McNerney	Schradner
Buchanan	Huelskamp	Ribble	Huffman	Meng	Schwartz
Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)	Israel	Michaud	Scott (VA)
Burgess	Hultgren	Rigell	Jackson Lee	Miller, George	Scott, David
Calvert	Hunter	Roby	Jeffries	Moore	Serrano
Camp	Hurt	Roe (TN)	Johnson (GA)	Moran	Sewell (AL)
Campbell	Issa	Rogers (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (FL)	Shea-Porter
Cantor	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)	Kaptur	Nadler	Sherman
Capito	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (MI)	Keating	Napolitano	Sinema
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher	Kelly (IL)	Neal	Sires
Cassidy	Jones	Rokita	Kennedy	Negrete McLeod	Slaughter
Chabot	Jordan	Rooney	Kildee	Nolan	Smith (WA)
Chaffetz	Joyce	Ros-Lehtinen	Kilmer	O'Rourke	Speier
Coble	Kelly (PA)	Ross	Kind	Owens	Swalwell (CA)
Coffman	King (IA)	Rothfus	Kirkpatrick	Pallone	Takano
Cole	King (NY)	Royce	Kuster	Pascarell	Thompson (CA)
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Runyan	Langevin	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (MS)
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (WI)	Larsen (WA)	Payne	Tierney
Conaway	Kline	Salmon	Larson (CT)	Pelosi	Titus
Cook	Labrador	Sanford	Lee (CA)	Perlmutter	Tonko
Cotton	LaMalfa	Scalise	Levin	Peters (CA)	Tsongas
Cramer	Lamborn	Schock	Lewis	Peters (MI)	Van Hollen
Crawford	Lance	Schweikert	Lipinski	Peterson	Vargas
Crenshaw	Lankford	Scott, Austin	Loeb sack	Pingree (ME)	Veasey
Culberson	Latham	Sensenbrenner	Lofgren	Pocan	Vela
Daines	Latta	Sessions	Lowenthal	Polis	Velázquez
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Shimkus	Lujan Grisham	Price (NC)	Visclosky
Denham	Long	Shuster	(NM)	Quigley	Walz
Dent	Lucas	Simpson	Luján, Ben Ray	Rahall	Wasserman
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)	(NM)	Richmond	Schultz
DesJarlais	Lummis	Smith (NE)	Lynch	Roybal-Allard	Waters
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Smith (NJ)	Maffei	Ruiz	Watt
Duffy	Marino	Smith (TX)	Maloney	Ruppersberger	Waxman
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Southerland	Carolyn	Ryan (OH)	Welch
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Stewart	Maloney, Sean	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (FL)
Farenthold	McCaul	Stivers	Matheson	T.	Yarmuth
Fincher	McClintock	Stockman	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta	
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Stutzman			
Fleischmann	McKeon	Terry	Ellmers	Herrera Beutler	Meeks
Fleming	McKinley	Thompson (PA)	Gabbard	Higgins	Rush
Flores	McMorris	Thornberry	Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)
Forbes	Rodgers	Tiberi			
Fortenberry	Meadows	Tipton			
Fox	Meehan	Turner			
Franks (AZ)	Messer	Upton			
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Valadao			
Gardner	Miller (FL)	Wagner			
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Walberg			
Gerlach	Miller, Gary	Walden			
Gibbs	Mullin	Walorski			
Gibson	Mulvaney	Weber (TX)			
Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Webster (FL)			
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Wenstrup			
Goodlatte	Noem	Westmoreland			
Gosar	Nugent	Whitfield			
Gowdy	Nunes	Williams			
Granger	Nunnelee	Wilson (SC)			
Graves (GA)	Olson	Wittman			
Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Wolf			
Griffin (AR)	Paulsen	Womack			
Griffith (VA)	Pearce	Woodall			
Grimm	Perry	Yoder			
Guthrie	Petri	Yoho			
Hall	Pittenger	Young (AK)			
Hanna	Pitts	Young (IN)			
Harper	Poe (TX)				
Harris	Pompeo				
Hartzler	Posey				

NAYS—194

Andrews	Chu	Doyle
Barber	Cielline	Duckworth
Barrow (GA)	Clarke	Edwards
Bass	Clay	Ellison
Beatty	Cleaver	Engel
Becerra	Clyburn	Enyart
Bera (CA)	Cohen	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Connolly	Esty
Bishop (NY)	Conyers	Farr
Blumenauer	Cooper	Fattah
Bonamici	Costa	Foster
Brady (PA)	Courtney	Frankel (FL)
Braley (IA)	Crowley	Fudge
Brown (FL)	Cuellar	Gallego
Brownley (CA)	Cummings	Garamendi
Bustos	Davis (CA)	Garcia
Butterfield	Davis, Danny	Grayson
Capps	DeFazio	Green, Al
Capuano	DeGette	Green, Gene
Cárdenas	Delaney	Gutiérrez
Carney	DeLauro	Hahn
Carson (IN)	DeBene	Hanabusa
Cartwright	Deutch	Hastings (FL)
Castor (FL)	Dingell	Heck (WA)
Castro (TX)	Doggett	Himes

NOT VOTING—9

Ellmers	Herrera Beutler	Meeks
Gabbard	Higgins	Rush
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)

□ 1412

Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. SINEMA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 536, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 252, noes 172, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 537]

AYES—252

Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Amash	Black	Camp
Amodei	Blackburn	Campbell
Bachmann	Boustany	Cantor
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Capito
Barber	Braley (IA)	Carter
Barletta	Bridenstine	Cassidy
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Chabot
Barrow (GA)	Brooks (IN)	Chaffetz
Barton	Brown (GA)	Coble
Benishek	Buchanan	Coffman
Bentivolio	Bucshon	Cole
Bera (CA)	Burgess	Collins (GA)
Bilirakis	Bustos	Collins (NY)

Conaway Joyce
Cook Keating
Cotton Kelly (PA)
Cramer King (IA)
Crawford King (NY)
Crenshaw Kingston
Culberson Kinzinger (IL)
Daines Kline
Davis, Rodney Labrador
DelBene LaMalfa
Denham Lamborn
Dent Lance
DeSantis Lankford
DesJarlais Latham
Diaz-Balart Latta
Duffy Lipinski
Duncan (SC) LoBiondo
Duncan (TN) Loeb sack
Ellmers Long
Farenthold Lucas
Fincher Luetkemeyer
Fitzpatrick Lummis
Fleischmann Lynch
Fleming Maloney, Sean
Flores Marchant
Forbes Marino
Fortenberry Massie
Foster Matheson
Foxy McCarthy (CA)
Franks (AZ) McCaul
Frelinghuysen McClintock
Gallego McHenry
Garcia McIntyre
Gardner McKeon
Garrett McKinley
Gerlach McMorris
Gibbs Rodgers
Gibson Meadows
Gingrey (GA) Meehan
Gohmert Messer
Goodlatte Mica
Gosar Miller (FL)
Gowdy Miller (MI)
Granger Miller, Gary
Graves (GA) Mullin
Graves (MO) Mulvaney
Griffin (AR) Murphy (FL)
Griffith (VA) Murphy (PA)
Grimm Neugebauer
Guthrie Noem
Hall Nugent
Hanna Nunes
Harper Nunnelee
Harris Olson
Hartzler Palazzo
Hastings (WA) Paulsen
Heck (NV) Pearce
Hensarling Hoyer
Holding Peters (CA)
Hudson Peters (MI)
Huelskamp Petri
Huizenga (MI) Pittenger
Hultgren Pitts
Hunter Poe (TX)
Hurt Pompeo
Issa Posey
Jenkins Price (GA)
Johnson (OH) Radel
Johnson, Sam Rahall
Jones Reed
Jordan Reichert

NOES—172

Andrews Cohen
Bass Connolly
Beatty Conyers
Becerra Cooper
Bishop (GA) Costa
Bishop (NY) Courtney
Blumenauer Crowley
Bonamici Cuellar
Brady (PA) Cummings
Brown (FL) Davis (CA)
Brownley (CA) Davis, Danny
Butterfield DeFazio
Capps DeGette
Capuano Delaney
Cárdenas DeLauro
Carney Deutch
Carson (IN) Dingell
Cartwright Doggett
Castor (FL) Doyle
Castro (TX) Duckworth
Chu Edwards
Cicilline Ellison
Clarke Engel
Clay Enyart
Clever Eshoo
Clyburn Esty

Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Lance
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Farr
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Doyle
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur

Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
Royce
Ruiz
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore

Gabbard
Garamendi
Herrera Beutler

Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz

NOT VOTING—7

Higgins
McCarthy (NY)
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1419

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SURVIVOR BENEFITS CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS RESOLUTION, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 91) making continuing appropriations for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 425, nays 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 538]

YEAS—425

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus

Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass

Beatty
Becerra
Benishak
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis

Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot

Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher

Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)

Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewisi
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall

Rangel	Schwartz	Tonko
Reed	Schweikert	Tsongas
Reichert	Scott (VA)	Upton
Renacci	Scott, Austin	Valadao
Ribble	Scott, David	Van Hollen
Rice (SC)	Sensenbrenner	Vargas
Richmond	Serrano	Veasey
Rigell	Sessions	Vela
Roby	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Roe (TN)	Shea-Porter	Visclosky
Rogers (AL)	Sherman	Wagner
Rogers (KY)	Shimkus	Walberg
Rogers (MI)	Shuster	Walden
Rohrabacher	Simpson	Walorski
Rokita	Sinema	Walz
Rooney	Sires	Wasserman
Ros-Lehtinen	Slaughter	Schultz
Roskam	Smith (MO)	Waters
Ross	Smith (NE)	Watt
Rothfus	Smith (NJ)	Waxman
Roybal-Allard	Smith (TX)	Weber (TX)
Royce	Smith (WA)	Webster (FL)
Ruiz	Southerland	Welch
Runyan	Speier	Wenstrup
Ruppersberger	Stewart	Westmoreland
Ryan (OH)	Stivers	Whitfield
Ryan (WI)	Stockman	Williams
Salmon	Stutzman	Wilson (FL)
Sánchez, Linda	Swalwell (CA)	Wilson (SC)
T.	Takano	Wittman
Sanchez, Loretta	Terry	Wolf
Sanford	Thompson (CA)	Womack
Sarbanes	Thompson (MS)	Woodall
Scalise	Thompson (PA)	Yarmuth
Schakowsky	Thornberry	Yoder
Schiff	Tiberi	Yoho
Schneider	Tierney	Young (AK)
Schock	Tipton	Young (IN)
Schrader	Titus	

NOT VOTING—6

Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	Turner
Higgins	Rush	Young (FL)

□ 1433

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 538, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

SHUTDOWN ISSUES

(Mr. POSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, most people are surprised and actually stunned and amazed to discover that the Senate and the House have agreed—at least for the next 5 weeks—on a level of funding.

This is not an argument about money. This shutdown is not about money. There are only two issues stopping the shutdown from coming to an end right this second. The President was on television yesterday, for over an hour, and never mentioned those two issues.

We've agreed on the money. Here are the issues:

Make Congress and the White House obey the same ObamaCare rules as everybody else in the United States of America.

The President gave Big Business and special interests a 1-year break from being a part of ObamaCare.

We want America's workers and families who work hard and play by the

rules to have the same advantage. That's what Republicans, Democrats, and Independents in my district say they want.

To give special benefits only to Big Business and special interests is not fair, it's not right, and it's not good for the United States of America.

VOTE ON A CLEAN CR

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I stand here on behalf of my Arizona district to once again make a simple request: allow a vote on a clean funding bill to reopen the government.

In the past week, House GOP leaders only allowed piecemeal votes on bills that went nowhere. Yesterday, they did it again. This time, they did it with Head Start funding, which is important for the 12 Native American tribes in my district. Schools on tribal lands have already taken a massive hit with sequestration cuts.

The shutdown is continuing this pain, not just with cuts to Head Start and impact aid, but with furloughs from the Indian Health Service and with cuts in funding for programs that protect women from violence.

These piecemeal games are a dead end. They only prolong the shutdown. If House leadership were genuinely concerned about programs like Head Start or Impact Aid, they would allow a vote to reopen the government.

Congress should stop picking winners and losers. This is not a game. We demand a vote on the budget.

LET'S GET OUR ACT TOGETHER

(Mrs. BACHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reiterate again that the bodies have agreed on the general numbers that we have to look at to deal with our budget. We need to do it. We need to get it done, and we need to get people back to work here in the United States of America.

The one thing that shocked me, Mr. Speaker, is last Saturday, I went with my colleague STEVE KING to The Mall because we wanted to open up the World War II Memorial, the Korean Memorial, and the Vietnam Memorial so that our veterans and the American people could visit them.

We were absolutely shocked to find the level of intimidation that was going on. Police dogs were held by park rangers, and mounted police were in front of the barriers in front of these monuments. That's shameful.

What was even more shameful is that there were 90-year-old people in 90-degree weather, and the park system had shut down not only the water fountain but also the bathrooms. We had 10

Honor Flights coming in to visit the World War II Memorial, and in one of the most undignified acts I've ever seen, the Greatest Generation was denied access to a public bathroom in the national park.

That's terrible. We wouldn't do that to anyone. That's why we need to get our act together and get this taken care of.

SHUTDOWN CONSEQUENCES FOR NEVADA

(Mr. HORSFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to give credit where credit is due and to commend a Republican who understands the negative consequences of this shutdown, and he is the Governor from my home State of Nevada, Governor Brian Sandoval.

Yesterday, he told the Las Vegas Sun that Nevada is struggling because of this ongoing shutdown. He said that Nevadans are going to "see some catastrophic issues going on for the State" if the shutdown continues.

The Sun reported that 362,000 food stamp recipients will see benefits end on November 1 as State employees who administer the program face potential furloughs. In addition, 425,000 women, infants, and children would be cut from food assistance rolls. Rape crisis call centers may be closed. Unemployment claims will not be processed.

Republicans in Congress need to recognize what's happening in their States. Listen to your constituents. Listen to your State legislators and Governors.

This shutdown needs to end, and it needs to end now.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Las Vegas, NV, October 8, 2013.

Hon. HARRY REID,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, DC.

Hon. DEAN HELLER,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JOE HECK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. DINA TITUS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MARK AMODEI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. STEVEN HORSFORD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN: Your service to our state is vitally important, and I want to thank you for your work and dedication. I know we all put Nevada first and understand how special and unique our great state is. We have all worked together to move our state forward, and I will always be grateful for your willingness to put partisanship aside when it comes to Nevada.

I feel compelled to write all of you to express my deep concern with the shutdown of the federal government and its potential impacts on our state. This shutdown impacts how the state operates, the services we are

able to provide, and has the potential to set our state back when it comes to economic recovery. In the most basic of terms, this is about ensuring people are fed, houses are kept, and jobs are available.

As you are aware, Nevada was the last state to emerge from the great recession. While we have made much progress since the height of the recession, our unemployment rate still remains above the national average, and our housing market has not fully recovered. And while Nevada's economy is once again expanding, a prolonged federal shutdown undermines consumer confidence and threatens economic growth nationally. Either of these outcomes endangers the tourism industry that is so important to our state.

Job creation and getting Nevadans working again has been my greatest priority since coming to office, and I know, as members of the federal delegation, it has been a priority of yours as well. However, I am concerned that we may be forced to take steps backwards as the impacts of this shutdown unfold on the economy. While we do not know the extent of the impact, we know even in the best of times the economic impact of a government shutdown is felt.

I am also deeply concerned about the possibility of a disruption in services to our state's neediest. Whether it is child nutrition programs, SNAP benefits, unemployment insurance, or dozens of other programs, this disruption in service undermines the economic and nutritional security of Nevadans. Those who are struggling may go hungry or be unable to pay their rent or mortgage. These services are designed to help those who have fallen on the hardest of times. A disruption to these services will be devastating for some.

The state has the ability to cover the cost of some federally funded programs during the shutdown by temporarily allocating money that has been set aside for other purposes. However, we have no assurances that the federal government will reimburse Nevada for any costs that it assumes during the shutdown. It is difficult to make informed choices on how to proceed absent swift action from the federal government to provide clear directions regarding which programs will be made whole and which will not. At a very minimum, the federal government needs to address this uncertainty so the state can plan financially and manage its affairs responsibly.

The State of Nevada cannot be expected to assume the costs of federal programs. We built our budget in good faith with reasonable assurances regarding federal funding levels. To that end, I have included a summary of the shutdown's impact on the people of Nevada. I implore each of you to work together to resolve the issues in Washington and to honor the federal commitment to Nevada.

Thank you for your attention to this most important matter. As always, I am available to each of you should the need arise to discuss this further.

Sincere regards,

BRIAN SANDOVAL,
Governor.

RESPECT FOR OUR FALLEN HEROES

(Mr. HUDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been 8 days since the government shut down. The postal service is still run-

ning. Social Security and unemployment checks are being processed. Citizens can get passports and food stamps, and certain groups that have the right ideology are even given permits to protest on our National Mall; but for some reason, our military families, including those at Fort Bragg in North Carolina, cannot receive emergency death benefits.

This is worse than excusable. It's shameful.

Last week, Congress unanimously passed the Pay Our Military Act, with the intent that all military pay and allowances will be disbursed during the government shutdown. Unfortunately, this administration has been playing political theater with the families of our war heroes who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

To make our intent crystal clear, today the House passed the Honoring the Families of Fallen Soldiers Act. Certain things should transcend politics, and it is up to the Senate and the administration. In fact, they have a moral obligation to join the efforts of the House to fix this problem and to express our deepest gratitude to the families of our heroes.

CONSTITUTIONAL DUTIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue of increasing relevance to our national affairs and to constitutional government properly understood—and that is the requirement that the President faithfully enforce the laws of the land and the failure of the current incumbent to satisfy that obligation.

The Constitution sets out a simple yet effective structure: the major powers of government—legislative, executive, and judicial—are divided into three separate branches of government. The legislative branch—the Congress—passes laws, makes law; the executive branch—the President—enforces law; and the judicial branch—the Supreme Court and inferior courts—interprets laws.

Article II, section 3 of the Constitution imposes upon the President the duty to “take care that the laws be faithfully executed.” This duty has roots in Anglo American law dating back to the Glorious Revolution of 17th century Britain. In fact, the English Bill of Rights of 1689 provided that:

The pretended power of suspending laws, or the execution of laws, by regal authority, without the consent of parliament, is illegal.

For his part, the Founder of our country, George Washington, saw the faithful execution of the law to be one of the President's core responsibilities. In a letter to Alexander Hamilton, then-President Washington explained that the Constitution's “take care” clause meant:

It is my duty to see the laws executed: to permit them to be trampled with impunity would be repugnant to that duty.

The duty of the President to “take care that the laws be faithfully executed” is a central component not simply of the executive branch of government, but to the entire constitutional system.

□ 1445

Yet the conduct of the current incumbent has evinced a disregard for this core constitutional duty. By picking and choosing which laws to enforce, the President has undermined the constitutional order and has failed to keep faith with the basic idea that ours is a government of laws, not of men.

Now the most conspicuous vehicle for the President's disregard of the Take Care duty has been the implementation of the law that bears his name—the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, aka ObamaCare.

Now, it is interesting that of all the arguments that have been put forward to counter those who seek to defund, delay, or repeal this law, the one that ObamaCare supporters have embraced most frequently as of late goes like this: ObamaCare is the law of the land and has been upheld by the Supreme Court; therefore, it cannot be repealed, defunded, or delayed.

Now, this is a nonsensical argument on its face. Congress has the authority to legislate, per article I of the Constitution, and can amend, supercede, or repeal ordinary legislation as it sees fit. But this argument is particularly rich regarding ObamaCare. Because if this law is somehow sacrosanct, then why is the President not enforcing it as written? It is untenable to assert that Congress cannot change the law through legislation but that the President can delay or waive provisions of the law by executive fiat. Exhibit A for this, as it relates to ObamaCare, is the President's unilateral decision for 1 year to delay the enforcement of the so-called employer mandate, a central provision of ObamaCare requiring most businesses to provide government-sanctioned insurance to their employees.

Now, section 1513(d) of that law states that the employer mandate “shall apply to the months beginning after December 31, 2013.” Note the statutory command of “shall.” This is not discretionary, and there is no provision of the law permitting the Executive to delay it.

Incredibly, the President has not offered any coherent rationale for his actions. He was asked in an interview with The New York Times whether his critics were justified in asserting that he lacked authority to delay the mandate. He responded by saying:

If Congress thinks that what I've done is inappropriate or wrong in some fashion, they're free to make that case. But there's not an action that I take that you don't have some folks in Congress who say that I'm usurping my authority. Some of those folks think I usurped my authority by having the gall to win the Presidency. And I don't think

that's a secret. But ultimately, I'm not concerned about their opinions—very few of them, by the way, are lawyers, much less constitutional lawyers.

In other words, the President doesn't care what Congress thinks, as elected Representatives of the people, and feels no need to justify his official conduct.

Now, a couple weeks later he was asked again about this decision to unilaterally delay the mandate, and he said, look, he "didn't simply choose to delay this on my own" because the decision was made "in consultation with businesses all across the country."

Now, I have searched the Constitution in vain for the provision allowing the President to suspend article II, section 3 of the Constitution so long as he consults with business, but I have not found it.

What is even worse, though is that the President further justified his conduct by stating:

In a normal political environment, it would have been easier for me to simply call up the Speaker and say, you know what, this is a tweak that doesn't go to the essence of the law. Let's make a technical change of the law. That would be the normal thing that I would prefer to do, but we're not in a normal atmosphere around here when it comes to ObamaCare.

That's the end of the President's quote.

Now, this is absurd. The Constitution doesn't relieve the President of his duty to faithfully enforce the law simply because the political environment is difficult. Second, the President didn't, in fact, need to call the Speaker, because a couple weeks before his comment, this House voted 264-161—with 35 Members of the other party voting "yes"—to delay the mandate by law for 1 year. Most of us in the House actually think that, as a matter of policy, the employer mandate is bad for the economy. The President responded to our request to delay the employer mandate by threatening to veto the bill.

Now, with respect to the employer mandate, the emperor truly has no clothes. The unilateral delay of this mandate is not consistent with the Constitution's Take Care clause and is an abridgement of Congress' constitutional duty to make the law. The separation of powers is designed to ensure a government of laws, not of men. This President is content to be a law unto himself.

Now, the employer mandate delay is not an exception that proves the rule, unfortunately. Far from it. The entire enterprise of ObamaCare implementation has been an exercise in the administration picking and choosing which provisions to enforce and which provisions to delay or waive. Rather than implement the law as written, the President is rewriting the law as he goes along.

The following list represents a pretty impressive display of this lawlessness:

ObamaCare contains a statutory cap on out-of-pocket health costs, yet the President suspended this provision,

most likely because he feared it would lead to health insurance premiums rising even more than they already are.

Second, the law requires the State-based ObamaCare health insurance exchanges to verify whether applicants for exchange subsidies qualify for subsidies based on their income level. Yet the President suspended this requirement, thereby allowing taxpayer money to be handed out based on the "honor system"; and we know that it's going to hit the taxpayer more than if you actually enforce the regulations.

The plain text of ObamaCare also provides that subsidies can only flow through State-based exchanges, yet the President's IRS is disregarding this requirement and is allowing subsidies to flow to Federal exchanges.

So this is creating, I think, a patently unjust scenario: The law imposes substantial burdens on society as a whole, but those with political connections—employers, insurance companies, what have you—are granted delays and/or waivers from the law's burdens. This is precisely contrary to James Madison's admonition in the Federalist No. 57 that there should be "no law which will not have its full operation on the political class and their friends, as well as on the great mass of society."

The most egregious example, though, of political favoritism via executive branch lawlessness has got to be the illicit bailout for Members of Congress with respect to congressional health plans. Now, when the bill was being debated several years ago, the American people were told we have to pass the bill to find out what is in the bill. And sure enough, the law contained all sorts of surprises, including an interesting provision regarding health care for Members of Congress.

Now there is broad agreement among analysts who have looked at the effects of ObamaCare that the law's structures and incentives will cause millions of Americans to lose their employer-provided coverage and get pushed into these health care exchanges. The only dispute really is how many millions of Americans will suffer this fate. The Congressional Budget Office said 7 million. Other analysts have said it's going to be tens of millions of Americans.

Perhaps recognizing this possibility, one section of ObamaCare makes Congress eat its own cooking. The idea behind the provision is that, because ObamaCare will upend the health care arrangements of other Americans, Members of Congress and other political insiders should be placed in exactly the same position as their fellow citizens whom they have burdened, and thus Members of Congress must go and get insurance through these ObamaCare exchanges. No more gold-plated plans for Washington, given Washington is having a negative effect on other Americans.

Now, one can search the health care law in vain for any provision providing

Members of Congress taxpayer-financed subsidies for use on these ObamaCare exchanges. It's just not there. In fact, as Politico reported, the Office of Personnel Management initially said that lawmakers and staffers couldn't receive subsidies once they went into the exchange because there was no authority to give them subsidies. This is probably also because any other American who loses their health coverage and goes into the exchanges is prohibited from getting a tax-excludable employer contribution.

This state of play didn't sit well with a lot of Members of Congress. So after being lobbied by Members of both the House and Senate, the President pledged to "fix the issue." He ordered OPM to reverse course and grant unique taxpayer subsidies to Members of Congress and other Washington insiders—again, without having a statutory authority to do so.

So this is a lawlessness in service of liberating Members of Congress from having to live under the terms of the laws that they impose on others. And this is creating all sorts of problems of fairness and equity.

I think the Founding Fathers had it right when they said that the President did have a duty to take care that the laws would be faithfully executed. And that word "faithfulness" means something. Yes, you have discretion as an executive to enforce laws to a certain degree or not, depending on the situation. That is a natural aspect of prosecutorial discretion. But the idea that you can just supercede or delay laws by executive fiat is something that's foreign to our constitutional tradition.

I'm going to yield in a second to the gentleman from Oklahoma, but think about this: Had Mitt Romney won the 2012 election and he came in and started delaying or waiving parts of ObamaCare with impunity and with no congressional authorization, can you imagine the uproar that we would be hearing from the press and from our friends on the other side of the aisle? I think it would be very loud in here if that were the case.

At this time, I thank my friend from Oklahoma for coming, and I yield to him.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Well, I really appreciate it.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), who has been such a great leader on constitutional issues in this body. And I'd like to say that, here you have a gentleman who went to Yale undergraduate and he played baseball. He got a law degree from Harvard, and then he decided to join the United States Navy. He has served bravely in the United States Navy as a JAG officer, and now he's serving in the United States Congress. So if there is anybody in this body who has the credibility to discuss these constitutional issues, it is my good friend from Florida, RON DESANTIS. And I appreciate your leadership on these issues.

When you think about the constitutional process, Mr. Speaker, there is one particular issue that is near and dear to me, that is near and dear to my constituents, that we have seen this body go through earlier this year, and that is the issue of gun control. I think it was back in April. The President had an agenda and HARRY REID had an agenda, and their agenda was to outlaw certain types of guns. These guns didn't operate any differently than other types of guns; they just looked scary, so they wanted to ban them.

Interestingly, that effort died in the Senate and it never came to the House of Representatives. So then they started another effort, and that effort was for what would eventually be a national gun registry. They called it "universal background checks," but ultimately it would be a national gun registry, and that effort died in the Senate.

Now, the constitutional process, if the President wants his agenda enacted, he needs to go to the United States Senate or the House of Representatives and pass a law, in a bicameral process, and eventually it needs to go to his White House for signing. Ultimately, this bill did not have the will of the American people. This bill did not have the desire of the Members in this body to pass that bill. So what the President did recently—which I believe is egregious—is he decided to enter the United States of America into an international treaty to accomplish the very objectives that the House of Representatives and the Senate had rejected, and that's the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

Under this treaty, anybody who purchases a gun internationally—if a gun comes from another country, maybe a Glock from Austria—well, then you have to enter into an international database. You have to enter your name and your address and your phone number. There will be an international database of anybody who buys a gun that was ultimately produced in a country other than the United States.

And let me be clear about this, because I've talked to a lot of gun manufacturers. Many parts of many guns are not made in the United States. You could have a handle that's made in China. You could have a trigger that's made in Mexico. If you look at most of the guns that are made in the United States, major parts of them are made elsewhere, which means that we are going to have a national gun registry that will have an international body overseeing our national gun registry per the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty.

Now, for the President of the United States to have an agenda item that doesn't get through the Senate, that doesn't get through the House of Representatives, that never comes to his desk for signing, that he is ideologically committed to this—which is a violation of the Second Amendment of the United States Constitution—for

him to then enter into a treaty, an international treaty where there will be an international body responsible for overseeing this treaty, to me, is an egregious lack of leadership and certainly violates the intention of the Constitution. The President knows full well that the Senate will never ratify this treaty.

And this is another important point, I think. The President has had other agenda items. He wanted to sign us up for other treaties—the United Nations Convention for the Rights of Children, the United Nations Convention for the Rights of Women, the United Nations Convention for the Rights of the Disabled. There are all these conventions, and they're all seemingly very good conventions; but what I would say is this: The United States of America has laws, and those laws are far more stringent than these treaties.

□ 1500

For what purpose would we sign on to a treaty when our laws themselves are stronger at adhering to the principles that these treaties are trying to promote? Why would we sign on? Why would we turn over our sovereignty to an international body? I personally don't understand it.

The United States is a leader in the world. We can lead the world by example, but signing over our sovereignty so that there will be an international body that comes in and inspects our country because the President has an ideology that he couldn't get through the House, that he couldn't get through the Senate, that ultimately these treaties were not going to be ratified by the Senate, I think it is egregious.

Certainly the Second Amendment of the United States is, quite frankly, not up to debate by foreigners, and it is not up to debate by foreign bodies. Foreign governments cannot come into the United States and force us to overturn our own constitutional amendment—the Second Amendment.

That is, I think, another example of where this President has overreached beyond his constitutional authority in certainly passing laws—not actually passing laws, but creating treaties because he can't get his laws passed—that would violate our Constitution.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. Thank you for those comments, and thank you for the service that you have given to the country, here in the Congress, but particularly as a naval aviator flying more than one platform—the E-2D Hawkeye and then also the F-18 Super Hornet.

You have been deployed in harm's way numerous times, and you speak with a great deal of authority, not only on these issues, but on issues related to national security. I think it has been great that the gentleman and I have had a mutual pact to be supporting our blue-water Navy because there is no other weapon in the world like it when you can move a carrier 90 miles off somebody's coast and project power.

With that, I would like to recognize another one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SALMON), a guy who has been here before, he has walked the walk, and one of the few guys who will tell you what his principles are and will come here and will actually put those principles into action. He did it in the '90s and he is doing it again.

Mr. SALMON. Thank you very much.

First of all, I want to say what an honor it is to be sharing the dais with two such distinguished gentlemen who have given up their careers and sacrificed countless hours with their families to come to this body and not, as has been done before, be willing to "kick the can down the road"; coming to make real change; coming to try to get our arms around the real problems that are confronting our society and us as a Nation.

I would like to say that it is just a debt crisis, that it is just funding for our government. But I think we all know it is much more than that. It is about the freedoms that we hold. It is about everything that we hold dear—everything that every military person for the last 240 years has fought to defend—and that is the freedoms that our Founding Fathers envisioned when they started this great experiment. We don't want to let that experiment die.

I am so honored to be able to serve with two gentlemen that take this seriously and are willing to do more than be politicians and risk those political careers to actually do what is right. What a novel idea for Washington, D.C.

I would like to talk just a little bit about the genesis of the President's health care law when we talk about the constitutionality. They cooked this thing up at a time when they knew that time was running short. A new Senator had just been elected from Massachusetts, so they had to act very, very quickly, or they wouldn't be able to get by the cloture vote. That is why NANCY PELOSI ended up saying, we have to pass it before we know what is in it and then we can read it afterwards, because virtually none of those Senators actually read it.

That is why I understand Wolf Blitzer just came on today and said: Mr. President, why don't you postpone ObamaCare for a year?

Why? Because we have seen over the last week it is a failure. Its roll-out has been catastrophic. We want to stop the hemorrhage and help the American people.

How did the bill eventually become a law? It happened because they did a "strike all" on a bill that was originated in the House. But they did a "strike all" with language that had nothing to do with the original language.

Why is that important? Because in the Constitution there is a provision called the origination clause. That stipulates that any revenue bill has to originate in the House of Representatives. It has to. That is a requirement

for the Constitution, but this bill actually started in the Senate—ObamaCare started in the Senate. So constitutionally from day one it started out on shaky footing. They violated the Constitution right out of the shoot.

Now, let's fast-forward to where we are today. Congressman DESANTIS, you have done a marvelous job describing some of the inconsistencies and the breaches of the Constitution that this President has done in actually changing his own law. We say it is his own law—it is Congress' law. It is a law that a President can't enact in and of itself and he can't change in and of himself. We don't have a line-item veto anywhere. The President can only change the law if it goes through Congress first. So like you said, Congressman DESANTIS, he arbitrarily changed the date in the law from one year to the next, and you can't do that.

I have heard from the Democratic Party time and time again—the folks on the other side—that they can't support this pathway that we have been going through in the last week of putting bills up on funding various aspects of government, like funding for NIH and kids with cancer or funding our veterans or funding our national parks. They say that that is a process of creating winners and losers, and they can't have any part of that.

Well, what is President Obama doing when he is giving breaks to Big Business and to Congress, but he is not giving them to every other American when it comes to ObamaCare? Isn't that creating winners and losers? I think it is a tad hypocritical of them to even raise that specter.

But I want to talk for a little bit about what has happened in the last week and a half. Because while the President is very willing to exceed his constitutional authority to do certain things, when he does have the constitutional authority to do something, he doesn't do it.

What am I talking about? I am talking about what has happened over the last few days with the bill that we passed last Saturday before the shutdown funding our military, the Pay Our Military Act. It was clear in that bill, that very succinct bill, that they had the power to pay all of our military folks, including all of our civilians, and that they could go ahead and take care of the death benefits for these widows who have lost their loved ones in war. That was very, very clear. They had that ability all along.

So what does the President do? He wants to use this for political leverage and make this as painful as he possibly can. So what do they do? They furlough several hundred thousand civilian workers within the military, just so they could ratchet up the pain and make it a little bit tougher on the Republicans.

Then what happens? About a week later Chuck Hagel, the Secretary of Defense, comes out and says, Oops, my bad. I guess we had the power all along.

Wasn't that what we have been telling them all along? You have the power to go ahead and keep these people at work and not disrupt, but they did that for political gain so that he could make it as painful as possible.

One other example: in my own State, in Arizona, we have one of the greatest national parks, the Grand Canyon. It is not only a wonder for the entire world, but it is also a wonder for our economy. We have folks that are doing river raft trips, folks that do excursions and hikes down through the Grand Canyon; but they run into a closed park.

Well, let me tell you something: I was here during 1995 when we had that last government shutdown. And guess what? We had a Democratic President. His name was Bill Clinton. We had a Republican Governor, just like we do in Arizona right now. His name was Fife Symington. What happened with the government shutdown? President Clinton worked with our Republican Governor, Fife Symington, to allow them to use private and State resources to keep the park open.

So our Governor, Governor Brewer, writes a letter to President Obama thinking that he might be somewhat similar in nature to President Clinton as far as being willing to negotiate. I mean, these are people's lives on the line. What did they get? A big fat zero—no way, you can't open it.

We have seen that time and time again. We have seen it on the National Mall that when certain groups of people want to come and take a look at the monuments or go into the National Mall that, no, the government is shut down, you can't come in, everything is shut.

But yesterday, what happened in the National Mall? Fifteen thousand people came for a protest on immigration reform, and they opened up the National Mall.

It is a disturbing pattern. If you agree with the President and his policies, we are going to do everything within our power to use government to help you get where you need to be. If you disagree with me, we are going to use our government to bludgeon you and use it as a tool to further our political agenda.

That has happened with the IRS when it comes to the nonprofit status of various organizations. It happened with our Capital Mall and our Capital monuments.

All I am saying is that I find it so incredulous that the President is willing to overstep his boundaries and unconstitutionally do things through executive order, and yet when he has the power and we have given him the power he is not willing to do it. I find those inconsistencies extremely disturbing and a little bit Machiavellian.

I would hope that the President would look at what we are trying to do through this process. We have a responsibility to the people that elected us to make the laws as good as we possibly can.

The last proposal that we put on the table was that we would delay the individual mandate so that every American—as you said, Mr. DESANTIS—every American could get the same deal that Big Business with their great lobbyists here in Washington, D.C., got and that Members of Congress got. They would get the same consideration.

The other part was that we would make sure that Congress lived under the same laws everybody else has to. A pretty commonsense approach, so much so that multiple Democrats agreed with us and voted with us to pass that and send it to the President. But what did HARRY REID do? He shoved it in his draw at the behest of President Obama.

It is time to stop these reckless games. Mr. President, you have already shown that you are very willing to use your executive powers far beyond your scope of authority given you in the Constitution. Is it unreasonable for us to ask you to use your powers when you are given them to do the right thing?

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for those great comments.

I think he brings up a great point about the funding bill that was sent the day before the fiscal year ended was not demanding that the President fully repeal the health care law; it basically had two very reasonable policy asks:

One, that Members of Congress live under the exact terms of the law that they passed and not get any type of special unauthorized treatment; and then

Two, that individuals be given the same courtesy that the President gave to Big Business.

That was very reasonable. The press hasn't really reported that. That is not really the way they framed it. I am not surprised at that. But that is a vote—by standing beside the Senate majority leader, all those Senators who did that—that is going to be a vote that is going to reverberate into the future.

I think it is interesting because when we are talking about the proper constitutional authority of the President, our primary means to check the President is the power of the purse. That is basically what we are doing in terms of we are sending the funding bill, but we are saying, look, we cannot afford to continue going with this disparate treatment throughout society. You have got to treat everybody the same.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DESANTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I just wanted to ask you a quick question, which is, when you consider the fact that the media reporting is very different from what I have perceived in this body as a Member of Congress, I am more astonished every day at how the media reports the story. But the very last ask that we made before the government

shutdown was about 1 o'clock in the morning, so I guess technically the government had been shut down for about an hour. That very last ask was simply a meeting. It was simply a conference so that people on their side and people on our side could come together and discuss ObamaCare and some of the problems that we have with it.

Now, when you talk about the Constitution and the constitutional process that we have and you have divided government—I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida—is that not a perfectly reasonable adult way of handling disputes?

□ 1515

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman for the question. That is not only an adult way, that is exactly the way that the Founding Fathers envisioned it. James Madison, when he wrote about the different branches of separation of power, checks and balances, he said:

Ambition must be made to counteract ambition.

So you have an executive that gets beyond their scope, he expected the legislature to check that. So in this instance, we are saying, Wait a minute, you can't unilaterally delay the law for business, but then leave the rest of the American people holding the bag. You can't let Congress, the people who are imposing this law upon others, get out from under the exact text of the law. So in that sense, that's exactly the way the system is supposed to work.

Now he has a different view of, basically, the Congress needs to do what he decrees, and then he will grant Congress the courtesy of actually discussing issues with them. That would probably not have gone over very well with the Founding Fathers.

I want to just make another point because the gentleman from Arizona brought up how ObamaCare was passed and kind of the genesis of it. Some of our friends on the other side of the aisle that say, How can you guys be talking about this, it's the law, move on, not giving any credence to the 50 to 55 percent of Americans who are being negatively affected by it. But if you compare how that law was passed compared to any other major piece of legislation, I pulled some interesting numbers. Social Security in 1935, in the House of Representatives, 96 percent of the Democrats voted for it, 81 percent of the Republicans voted for it. The interstate highway system under Eisenhower, 93 percent in this body voted for it, 98 percent of the Republicans in this body voted for it. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, maybe the most important piece of legislation in the 20th century, 61 percent of the Democrats in the House voted for that piece of legislation, 80 percent of the Republicans in the House voted for that piece of legislation.

Even 1981, the Reagan economic program, in the Senate, 78 percent of the Democrats voted for Reaganomics, and

98 percent of Republicans voted for Reaganomics. When the gentleman from Arizona was here when they did welfare reform, you had a unified Republican Party joining with a number of Democrats and a Democratic President. So when you have this bill that never received any support from the other party and that rests on all these broken promises about your health care is going to decline by \$2,500 a family, you can keep your plan, keep your doctor, we know none of that is going to be true.

I just want to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma, yield to him because he and I had been discussing the idea of the President's responsibility to enforce border security and enforce laws related to immigration. I yield so you can discuss that.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. I appreciate that, and it is perfectly appropriate that we have the gentleman from Arizona here as well. The gentleman from Arizona, and when you serve in this body, you get to meet a lot of very interesting people that have done amazing things in their lives. The gentleman from Arizona who we heard from earlier had an opportunity to serve in this body back in the 1990s, and then he left. He had a term limit pledge. He honored his term limit pledge. And then he came back recently as a newly elected freshman with the rest of us, and it is an honor to serve with him. But in that hiatus when he was back in Arizona, he ran for the governorship of Arizona, and he darn near won. Interestingly, he ran against the person who won, who was Janet Napolitano, who became the Secretary of Homeland Security here in the Obama administration.

I would like to discuss some things about why it is so important for me personally. I am a Navy pilot, as the gentleman from Florida said, and I have flown combat. But interestingly, I have also flown counterdrug missions in Central and South America. And I can tell you without a doubt that the drug cartels that we fight down in Central and South America, they don't try to get the drugs into the United States of America anymore. Their only objective is to get the drugs to northern Mexico, where they are vertically integrated with gangs and other cartels who bring the drugs across the border without a hitch. Now, because we have these drug wars in northern Mexico—and, by the way, there are over 100,000 people who have been killed in the last 7 years in these drug wars in northern Mexico, but that exists because we have an open border policy on the south side of the United States.

So if you were to hand a 16-year-old kid a backpack with \$1 million worth of cocaine and you say to him, Hey, go across this border and get to that point, you're going to be very well rewarded. A 16-year-old kid will do that in many cases in these impoverished areas in northern Mexico. Interestingly, another 16-year-old kid will see

that backpack and want it for himself, and the next thing you know, you've got one killing the other, and then you get a third killing the second. And then you have these gangs form, and this is how you get to a point where you have cartels and gangs that are killing not only each other, 100,000 people, but they are also killing judges. They are killing police officers. They are killing politicians. And on top of it all, they are not just transporting cocaine, they are transporting young girls in the slave trade. And they are transporting weapons. This is happening in northern Mexico just south of our border. Mexico is on the brink of a failed state because of this, and it is the direct result of an open border policy.

Now the Secretary of Homeland Security, former Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano has been on record. What does she say? She says that the border is secure. That's what she says. I have just got to tell you that I know firsthand that it's not. And the people who live in Arizona know that it's not. The people who live in Texas know that it's not. The border is not secure.

But here's what we have done in this body. We have passed laws to secure the border. Has the border become secure? No. Have thousands of people died since those laws have been passed because we haven't secured the border? Yes.

The President's job per the Constitution is to faithfully execute the laws, not pick and choose which laws he wants to follow based on political preference, which is what he has been doing.

So if it is all right, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Arizona. You have been near and dear to this for a very long time. If you have some comments, I would love to have you share them.

Mr. SALMON. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. Yes, it has been something that we have been dealing with in a very up close and personal way.

As a matter of fact, about a month and a half ago, I had the good fortune to meet with Arizona's adjunct general. He's over the National Guard for Arizona. He was finishing up his term in office, and I said, Sir, what is your biggest concern when it comes to possible terrorist activity here in Arizona? We don't have a lot of the national weather pattern problems like they do in other parts of the country, like hurricanes and tornadoes. We have some dust storms every now and then, and we have had some terrible fires. But I was truly interested, and I wasn't trying to lead him in any direction. But he said, without a doubt, the thing that keeps me up at night, the thing that worries me more than anything is the porousness of our border, and the fact that about 15 percent of the people that we apprehended last year were not from Mexico. Many of those people were from the Middle East. What I worry about is because it is so lax and

so easy to get across our border, that some terrorist is going to be able to get across the border with a suitcase bomb and detonate it and a lot of people will be injured or killed. That was his big concern.

So then I had an opportunity to sit down with some of our ICE people that are stationed in Arizona. They are the ones responsible for interior enforcement. I had a long conversation with them. You know what they told me? They said, You know, we don't need a lot more assets to get the border secured; what we need is for this administration to enforce the law. We need them to let us do our jobs. We are law enforcement people. We see the law very, very clearly. We know what the laws state, but our hands have been tied by this administration. They won't let us do our jobs.

He then proceeded to tell me that we have done these surveys on a regular basis to try to determine where employee morale is at, and they said it's at an all-time low ever since they've been doing these surveys right now within ICE, especially in Arizona because they feel they are not empowered to do their jobs, and they wonder, what am I doing here. Many of them want to be transferred out or just kind of, you know, march in place and do their time and get out as soon as they can, but the morale is terrible. These are honorable, decent people who want to do their jobs.

The other side would have you believe that no, this is just about some honest people who want to come across the border and get jobs in the United States and take care of their families. It's not just about that. As we saw with Brian Terry, with the gun smuggling, Fast and Furious, guns are being smuggled across the border, drugs are being smuggled across the border, and unsavory characters who have bad ideas on what they want in the United States are coming across the border, and one day the piper is going to have to be paid. So the border is far from being secure. We have the ability to do it, but this administration will not let them do their jobs.

Mr. DESANTIS. Thank you for that. It's interesting. As you bring up former Secretary Napolitano, that brings up the Presidential appointment and confirmation process. The Constitution provides for Cabinet officers and judges, that the President will nominate, the Senate votes to advise and consent to confirm, and then at that point they can become appointed and fill the office.

There is also another provision in article II of the Constitution, in section 2, involving what are called recess appointments, and it says:

The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.

This made a lot of sense at the time, especially because you'd be in session,

people lived all over the country. They'd take a horse-drawn carriage to get to Washington and back, so the Senate may be out for months and months. The Founders didn't want government ground to a halt. It's been used more recently if the Senate is on a recess, the President can kind of strategically figure that out and appoint somebody who might not otherwise be confirmed. Well, what this President did was a step further than that. He actually said that if the Senate says that it's not in recess, if they are just adjourned for say a day, a couple days and they are having pro forma session, that that doesn't actually count as a recess in his judgment and he can go ahead and do recess appointments, people to the National Labor Relations Board and the Consumer Financial Protection Board that would not otherwise be able to be confirmed. A lot of people cried foul about this, and it actually got tied up in the courts. Normally, we have to check some of these things, but there was somebody who had standing to bring a lawsuit. It has gone to two different Circuit Courts of Appeal and they both said, Look, the President can't just unilaterally determine when the Senate is in recess. The Senate is either in recess or they are not. If it is just that they go to sleep at night and come back the next morning, the President can't wait until midnight and just thrust somebody into office. So both of those courts have said that the President has overstepped his authority by shoving these recess appointments in office while the Senate was not in a formal recess; they were just adjourned within that term of service. And so I think the Supreme Court is going to hear that this time. I think they are definitely very likely to agree with those courts and say if the President can determine when it is a recess, then the whole idea of advise and consent gets swallowed up by the exception, and that's just not something that's going to work.

The gentleman from Arizona is interesting with his history because I listed some major pieces of legislation and how they all got broad bipartisan support. And the last one I mentioned was the 1996 Welfare Reform Act which Congress basically passed. It got vetoed and passed again, and finally President Clinton signed it. And the core of that, as I understand it, was that you would actually try and incentivize work instead of dependency, and so it had work requirements for able-bodied folks. I think the results of that were very, very positive. It essentially changed the incentive structure and actually gave people hope to get off dependency and into a productive life.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona because the President has basically watered down those work requirements unilaterally, and I think that will have a negative effect.

Mr. SALMON. I thank the gentleman from Florida. Yes, I was right in the

middle of all those debates. As a matter of fact, before I came to Congress, the Arizona Legislature, which I was part of, actually passed a bill called Workfare, which was very similar to what we passed in 1996. It recognizes the idea, I think the truth, and there is an old Chinese proverb: If I catch a fish for you, you'll have food for a day. If I teach you to fish, you'll have food for your life.

That was the model we tried to employ, and that was that people have to work. They have to give something back for the welfare payments that they are given. It was called Workfare, and that is what we decided to do here in the Congress.

And it did one other thing, Congressman, that no government program can or normally does really do, and that is help instill dignity in people. I think one of the things that has really broken our country is that we have become this welfare state, a bunch of dependents across the country. I think that giving somebody the opportunity to be able to give something back actually helps preserve, I think, the human spirit. We all want to feel like we have some worth, that we have some relevance to society. And the old traditional welfare program is almost like we'll pay you to stay out of society. We'll give you just barely enough to subsist, but you stay out of society. And that's the message, subliminally or otherwise, that it gives to those people.

□ 1530

We don't really have much to offer you. You don't offer much value to society, so we will pay you to stay home. We thought of a different idea, I think a vastly more compassionate idea, and that is to have people be able to give something back so they didn't get something for nothing. Also, along the way, they actually got skills and abilities that they didn't otherwise have so that they could learn how to work, they could learn how to hold down a job.

That was one of the key components of the welfare reform that we passed in 1996, that while we send that money out to the States, that there are work requirements. I think that's reasonable. You don't get something for nothing. You have got to get out and help pull the wagon instead of having everybody cart you around. That's reasonable.

What did this President do the moment he got in office? He started through executive orders granting waivers to each of the States, getting rid of those work requirements. Again, that was a law that was passed in 1996, signed by President Clinton, and the President coming after changes the terms of those laws. To me, as far as I am concerned, not only is that lawless, it is foolish, because it is hurting the very people he purports to help. I believe that rather than helping them, it is keeping them down.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for that.

You mentioned just as the President came into office, and I remember the first thing, and I wasn't here. None of us were in Congress at the time. Just as a citizen, I was Active Duty Navy. You were probably too, Mr. BRIDENSTINE. But we had this stimulus bill that had been passed. This was a huge thing. Part of that, as I've learned more about it, is that there were actually requirements that the executive branch was supposed to submit timely reports that would document the different spending and what was going on. I think even the Vice President said, Hey, I am going to be the watchdog on this. It is, in fact, the case that most of those deadlines have just been completely disregarded, that you haven't seen the type of reporting that was envisioned by the law, and that's perhaps because the law wasn't successful at engineering an economic recovery.

Shortly after that, though, one of the biggest issues that happened in 2009 was the auto bankruptcy. This was something that was unusual because the White House actually got very involved on the ground in terms of refereeing the rights of the various parties, including the creditors.

I now yield some time to the gentleman from Arizona to discuss that because you had mentioned that was something that had bothered you at the time. The floor is yours.

Mr. SALMON. I appreciate that.

When we talk about the rule of law, the rule of law means that it applies equally to everyone. Of course, today, we have talked a lot about how within ObamaCare the rule of law does not apply equally to everyone. Some people get waivers. Depending on what kind of company you work for, some companies get waivers. Some unions get waivers. When it comes to individual health care policies, some people get grandfathered and they get to keep their policy, and other people get letters saying their policy is canceled.

We have exchanged, in this country, at this point under ObamaCare, the rule of law for the rule of man, where you have nameless, faceless bureaucrats that don't represent anybody and make decisions that change the law for individuals. That's not what was intended by the Founding Fathers.

As the gentleman from Florida said, when you think about creditor rights and you think about the bailout for Chrysler, you have different classes of creditors. In the case of the Chrysler bailout, you had secured creditors. That means that in the hierarchy structure, they were superior to the shareholders. They were superior because they were lending the money. They weren't the owners of the company. They had rights that were above the shareholders.

In the case of Chrysler, what happened is the President came in, like you said, and they got very involved.

In fact, they changed the rule of law for the rule of man, where you had bureaucrats coming in and making a decision that the secured creditors would be wiped out. In fact, they were bullied. I think they received 30 cents on a dollar for investment, if I remember correctly. But the secured creditors would be bullied to give up their investment, and the people who actually came out ahead were the unions, who were not secured creditors. This is a violation of bankruptcy law.

Again, the President's job is to faithfully execute the law, not change the law for political preference and not replace the rule of law with the rule of man, which is what they did in this case. Politically, they made a decision that the secured creditors would be wiped out, the unions would be made whole, and at the end of the day—here is the fallout from that: in the United States of America, all across this country, and in the world, people are making decisions about where they're going to invest money. If you look at the investment opportunities in the United States of America right now, if you're going to invest in Big Business, the whole too-big-to-fail mantra that we have heard over and over again, if you are going to invest in Big Business, you are going to have to take a risk, and that risk has nothing to do with the return on investment or whether or not the company is sound. That risk is now political risk. Because as an investor, politically you could be wiped out, even if you have a secured debt instrument.

When you replace the rule of law with the rule of man, especially as it relates to business, people make decisions to invest elsewhere. And if you look at our country right now and you look at the capital investment in our country, we could be doing much better. Of course, if we had a President that adhered to the law, rather than changing the law based on political preference, we might see more investment in our country. Of course, investment is how businesses grow. It is how they raise money to open up a new plant or open up a new store, and capital investment is how new firms get created and it is how jobs get created and grow. So what we have right now is the replacement of the rule of law for the rule of man, and it is been detrimental for our economy as it relates to the securities industry.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank both the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Arizona for coming here today to offer their views. Their comments are much appreciated. The great thing about these two guys is they will stand up to people, regardless of party. They will stand up to people in their own party. They will stand up to people in the other party if what they're trying to do is not the right thing because these guys want to do the right thing.

I just want to conclude by invoking two giants in American history in

terms of some of the issues that we discussed today and kind of what they mean.

The first is the Father of the Country, George Washington. When he took the reins as the first President of the United States, he made the comment "I walk on untrodden ground." So he had a great sense that it wasn't just about him. He was already the biggest hero in the country. He could have taken over the country after defeating the British. He could have been king, but he surrendered his sword and retired to Mount Vernon until he was called back to further service. He was very sensitive to the idea that he was trying to establish a framework for freedom that could last generations, and it wasn't just about his own personal glory. What he tried to establish was the proper role of an executive in a constitutional system. There's a lot of people that said you either have a strong executive and it is a monarchy, or you just can't have a strong executive. I think he laid the foundation to say, actually, you can have a constitutionally circumscribed executive power that was nevertheless a force of good for the country.

The other gentleman that I would like to mention is Abraham Lincoln, who's obviously one of the greatest presidents we have ever had. His earliest recorded speech was a speech before the Young Men's Lyceum of Springfield, Illinois. This was in the 1830s, so he still had decades before he was President. I don't think he had been elected to anything even locally at the time. He was really concerned about the future of the country because he said you had this great Revolution, you had this great Constitution, you had these wonderful decades where people were actually living and breathing that. Obviously, he felt that there was a lot of work to do because he spoke out against things like slavery, but he thought that the ball was moving in the right direction in terms of individual freedom. But he feared that as the Founding Fathers and their generation passed away, that people really wouldn't have something that they could all have to organize around and be faithful to in terms of our country. So what he told people to do was to really embrace constitutional principles and the rule of law.

In his speech, he said:

As the patriots of '76 did to support the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and laws let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor. Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty.

He went on to say:

And, in short, let it become the political religion of the Nation; and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes and tongues and colors and conditions sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.

I think what Lincoln was getting at was this idea of American

exceptionalism. It is not because we as Americans are anything special. I am certainly not anything special. It is not that we are so much better than anybody as people. The exceptional part of the country is the origins of the country and the principles that the country is designed to further. That, I think, is what Lincoln was talking about; that when you embrace the Declaration, when you embarrass the Constitution, you're embracing a framework in which individual liberty is the paramount objective of society, and that is why things like the separation of powers and proper lawfulness from the legislature and executive are so important. It is not just because this is all a game and we want to try to blow the whistle on people who are in the other party. It is because ultimately this constitutional structure and these protections are what make us different from all the countries that have come before and all the countries that have been founded since.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

INSIDE THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUDSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, for a government that shuts down, there sure seems to be a great deal going on. Down here on the Mall, somehow the National Park Service, which has been, parenthetically speaking here, presiding over a park service, beginning with the Franklin D. Roosevelt memorial, has not had God mentioned in any memorial since that time. We don't have time or a place for mentioning God, as our memorials have in some way in the past, but, by golly, we have got time during a shutdown to approve a permit to allow people who want to demand that—though they are here in this country illegally—they have a right to demand rights. This administration, just as it did with the Occupy Washington movement, facilitates that.

We know with the Occupy Washington movement there was all kinds of lewd, lascivious stuff going on in public. The Park Service didn't seem to be bothered by that. But let veterans show up to the World War II memorial, and they have got barricades. Let World War II veterans, who fought their way to the top of Mt. Suribachi, try to get to the monument that commemorates climbing to the top of Suribachi, they put up big obstacles to our veterans getting there.

So the message from this administration very clearly is that if you are illegally in the country, we will bend over backwards to let you commit all kinds of acts on the Mall; we will send Capitol Police down to pick up your garbage; and if you just want to illegally

occupy a public area, we will let you do that. We will let you use the basest services in public. All kinds of lewd and lascivious things were going on there with the Occupy Washington movement, and that was allowed to continue on and on and on.

□ 1545

However, if you have served your country in the United States military, then we're going to try to make life miserable for you. It just might be those people that have hung on to their God and their guns and love America and love the Constitution, so this Homeland Security thing is sure a threat. Which is quite interesting.

You know, with all the things that are going on, we have seen that this administration has not had a problem with some things that some of us felt were a problem, such as, like I've mentioned in the last couple of years, one of the members of what was originally the Countering Violent Extremism Working Group named Elibiary from Texas, who was placed on there. And then he got a promotion from Secretary Janet Napolitano up to the Homeland Security Advisory Council, and, gee, now we're finding out that he's continuing to defend one of the principals of the Holy Land Foundation.

We're finding out that he is still defending, he still considers them to be unjustly prosecuted even though Federal courts have found that crimes were committed and that terrorism was supported by the Holy Land Foundation. The Dallas Federal court, along with the U.S. Court of Appeals in New Orleans, found that groups like CAIR, which has now changed its name to WTF, and ISNA, groups like that were the largest front group for the Muslim Brotherhood in America.

So it's rather interesting, because this administration has made life so difficult for our veterans just trying to get here and enjoy the memorials. I've been down to the memorials I think every day until today, and it's amazing. I've been down there different days, all hours of the day and night. You're lucky if you see one park ranger in the area of the World War II Memorial, and yet now they've got them very strategically placed.

They will stand there with the barricades closed most of the time. If some group comes up and explains that they're a World War II veterans group, then they'll open and let them through, but they stand there intimidating. Sometimes an officer comes by with a canine, which is a bit more intimidating to most people. So unless Members of Congress are standing there, we see people come up and get intimidated and walk away, unless a Member of Congress goes up and says, Please, come in. You are welcome.

Fortunately, veterans of Vietnam and Korea are just going around the barricades and fortunately are not being stopped. At the Lincoln Memo-

rial, though, when a couple of Members of Congress encouraged people to come on up, like they do at the World War II Memorial, they said that it appeared that the park SWAT team—I mean, officers came in from all over, threatening arrests. Get out of here.

It's just amazing how far this administration will go to hurt Americans that love America, that have served this country.

And then we find out about Americans killed in Afghanistan. There should have been no problem whatsoever with the Defense Department cutting the \$100,000 checks to these families. There should not have been. And if there was any doubt, then the bill we passed before the shutdown began should have taken care of that. There was plenty of prerogative to do that. But we had to come back today and pass another bill just to say get a check to the families of those who lost a loved one serving this country, because the administration is playing hardball and has gotten policies in place that are hurting as many Americans as possible. But when you look at who's advising this country's top leaders, is it any surprise?

Here's a story from October 6 from The Daily Caller:

Senior adviser to the Department of Homeland Security is an old friend of an activist who was convicted in 2008 of financing the terrorist organization Hamas.

In an interview with The Daily Caller, Mohamed Elibiary, a member of the Homeland Security Advisory Council, reiterated claims he made this summer that former Holy Land Foundation President and CEO Shukri Abu Baker is innocent and a victim of political persecution.

Elibiary, who in his position on the council also has regular access to classified information, said the United States insults Muslim dignity and compared the Muslim Brotherhood to American evangelicals.

Elibiary confirmed to journalist Ryan Mauro of the Clarion Project in August that he is a longtime friend of Baker. The Mauro interview can be read at the Center for Security Policy.

Baker and four other officials of the closed Holy Land Foundation for Relief and Development were convicted of using the charity to finance Hamas in 2008. It was the largest terrorism financing trial in U.S. history. Federal prosecutors described the foundation, which was closed by the U.S. Government in 2001, as an entity of the U.S. Muslim Brotherhood.

Elibiary first disclosed the relationship in a 2007 article in The Dallas Morning News. He met Baker as a teenager and was so moved by the terrorist funder's explanation of alleged Israeli persecution of Palestinians that he says he began donating monthly to Baker's foundation until it closed in 2001. The friendship continued, with Elibiary meeting with Baker for coffee the day before he was convicted.

Elibiary maintains that Baker is innocent. And in 2010, he wrote that the U.S. Government was "using the law to force compliance with unjust foreign policies." He reiterated his belief that the U.S. should not have prosecuted the Holy Land Foundation.

The Muslim activist has never disguised his support for Muslim Brotherhood extremism. In a 2006 letter to the Morning News, he defended the fanatically anti-American

early Brotherhood leader and theorist Sayyid Qutb stating, "I'd recommend everyone read Qutb, but read him with an eye to improving America not just to be jealous with malice in our hearts."

Let me insert here, Qutb wrote, in Egypt, a book called "Milestones," where a guy named Osama bin Laden gives a great deal of credit for radicalizing him. And here we have someone that Janet Napolitano hand-picked to be at the highest advisory council level, have access to classified material, somebody that thinks the guy that radicalized Osama bin Laden is somebody we all should read with an eye toward improving America.

"Elibiary has been honored by the FBI's Society of Former Special Agents," the article says. And again, parenthetically here—it's not in the article, but we also know that the FBI continued a relationship with CAIR, even knowing that they had gathered evidence that showed that CAIR was a large Muslim Brotherhood front organization which was supportive of the Holy Land Foundation. Even knowing those things, even knowing that it was implicated as a named coconspirator in that trial, amazingly, it took until 2008 and 2009 for the FBI to suspend their partnership with CAIR. And we know that CAIR continued until they changed their name here recently in the last few weeks to WTF.

They continued to complain. They have instant access to anyone in this administration. They helped get the FBI material, training materials purged of anything that might be offensive to someone who was a radical Islamist.

The article says:

In September, Elibiary was promoted to senior adviser at the advisory council, a title held only by select members. Other council members include William Bratton, the revered former New York police commissioner and Los Angeles chief of police; former CIA Director Bill Webster; and L.A. County Sheriff Lee Baca.

And we have this, which has been tweeted out:

I'm honored to be reappointed to the Secretary of Homeland Security's Advisory Council and promoted to senior fellow position.

That's Mohamed Elibiary. This article says:

"If you've ever wondered why the Obama administration believes that the Muslim Brotherhood is a moderate force for good and partners with known U.S. Muslim Brotherhood entities, this interview with Mr. Elibiary helps us find an answer," Mauro said.

Elibiary received national attention in June 2012 when Minnesota Republican MICHELE BACHMANN and four other Members of Congress—one including me—wrote a letter to the Department of Homeland Security, naming him as one of three advisers with extensive ties to the Muslim Brotherhood and other Islamist organizations and causes.

Anyway, it's just amazing. And it is also amazing, when I confronted Sec-

retary Napolitano in a hearing about the fact that Mr. Elibiary had accessed classified material and I was told by the director of the Department of Public Safety, Steve McCraw, in Texas, he had spoken with her chief of staff. He had confirmed that he had briefed her totally on what Mr. Elibiary had done, and they would be looking into it. When I asked her about it the next day after her chief of staff had said she had been totally briefed, she looked me in the eye and said she didn't know anything about it. But she did say she would investigate.

We now know from a Freedom of Information answer from the Department of Homeland Security, they never investigated. Even when you had a writer, a journalist, Patrick Poole, wrote a story stating that Mr. Elibiary had actually shot two documents that they knew he had downloaded from the classified Web site, he had shopped it to a national media, and Mr. Poole confirmed to me that they have never once asked him about his sources. And we then had it confirmed from the FOIA request that actually they never did an investigation. Instead, they just promoted him. It is incredible. But then again, when you look at what this administration is doing to those who don't necessarily worship Allah but worship God and believe in God and have served the country, this administration is making it tough.

One of our most revered monuments, Mount Rushmore. Well, I was quoted accurately in the media over a week ago saying, After shutting down these open-air monuments, just sidewalks where you can roll around in disabled veterans' wheelchairs, what are they going to do next, put drapery over Mount Rushmore? Well, it turned out what they did—I guess I shouldn't have said anything because maybe it was the power of suggestion.

Oh, there's a way we can make people miserable. Even though it's a State road, built by the State of South Dakota, maintained by the State of South Dakota, patrolled by the State of South Dakota, we had Federal authorities go put cones and barricades to prevent people from being able to pull off to the side of the road to even take pictures of Mount Rushmore. Somebody, while the government was shut down, sent enough park rangers out to put up massive numbers of cones to try to make life as difficult as possible simply for people who loved America, who just wanted to pull over and get a view of Mount Rushmore.

□ 1600

They weren't going to patrol it. South Dakota does that.

When South Dakota, our dear friend, KRISTI NOEM, she said when South Dakota had pointed out, hey, this is State road, the Federal authority said, oh, no, but this is on Federal land, and we're not letting anybody pull over.

So this is what you get. This is the way Americans are treated unless

you're going to be illegally in the country and have a protest, then we will give you permits, whatever you want.

I was gratified to hear our friend, Representative NOEM, point out to us that, though sad that South Dakota had 4 feet of snow in some places, unfortunately, that covered all the barricades and cones, strictly in the interest of safety, South Dakota had to send their snowplows and wipe all the snow, and there was no way to sort out the cones and barricades, so apparently they were in some ditch somewhere.

But for safety purposes, because they were just trying to help those South Dakotans and Americans that wanted to see Mount Rushmore get through that road, that State-built road.

So, anyway, another chance to make Americans miserable, but Mother Nature came through, followed by South Dakota, making things safer.

Here is one. This is out by the Moore Farm that hasn't gotten a dime of Federal money since 1980. Former Park Director, National Park Service employee as director, been a director for 32 years, they barely make it, but they have lost \$15,000 to \$20,000 just by being closed down.

They rented barricades to take out there and close down a colonial farm from the 1700s and, as a result of this mean-spirited action by an administration, this farm may close down for good. They are running out of money.

But I have a dear friend that has arrived on the floor, and I would certainly yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for such time as he may consume.

Mr. LAMALFA I appreciate my colleague, Mr. GOHMERT, here on pointing out really the hypocrisy of what's going on with the public's lands, the public's parks, the way this is being used as leverage by the folks higher up in this administration to try and extract from the American people, from those of us in this House, perhaps, what they want.

He mentioned the thing in South Dakota there. Now, there is a lot of suffering going on in South Dakota where a lot of ranchers have lost a lot of livestock. And if anything, if your government has the ability to do something, it should be finding ways to help people, instead of putting up cones where they aren't supposed to be on a State highway they claim is on Federal land.

So if all those cones are in the bottom of the canyon that they may have had to rent or what have you, similar to the barricades they are putting up around the monuments and memorials here in this town, where they have to go out and rent barricades on company time with furloughed employees even to set them up and put sandbags in place, this an insult to the American people. It is an insult to all of our Honor Flight folks that have been coming in to town, anybody that would use what would normally be 24-hour memorials, 24-hour monuments.

So what gives? I don't understand.

You know, getting to the bottom of this here, we have this impasse in the Congress here in Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is about time this is ended because we are hurting the American people by the actions of this White House, by the impasse, the Senate.

We have sent over various, either all-inclusive CRs, or the bits and pieces we are doing to try and fund things as a priority, one at a time, that are very important to the American people. Funding our veterans, funding the basic ability when we have had fallen soldiers come home here in this recent news story, that their families can't even go pick them up because of an unyielding-ness by this administration, by those in the various bureaucracies to instead work to help American people in a time of fiscal straits that we are in, to help as much as possible, they are looking for ways to instead hurt them as much as possible.

What is with this?

We can even go back to previous impasses where, at least, President Clinton would sit down with the Republican House or Republican Senate or, after a while, it was a Republican House and Democrat-controlled Senate. There has been a mixture, over time, of putting aside the bitter partisanship and figuring out how we are going to hammer this out.

If we can do it with President Clinton, we can do it in previous Presidencies. This isn't the first time there has been this kind of impasse or this type of slowdown or shutdown. Yet this time seems to be unique in the meanness and the bitterness that's coming down from the intractability at the White House level and over on the Senate side as we have put forward solution after solution.

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time just momentarily, it is also worth noting that here in the House we have actually had numerous Democrats vote with us. So the only really bipartisan thing that has been going on in this whole Capitol are our bills to fund certain parts of the government.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. LAMALFA. Yes, thank you. Yes, we have had unanimous votes go off this floor with nearly 200 Democrats joining us on two of the pieces of legislation, and anywhere from 25 to 35 to 40 on many of the other pieces that have gone out. So it has been a bipartisan effort. I think both sides of the aisle see this is really a nonpartisan issue on these issues we are working on.

And so why do they have to rest on Senator RED's desk over on the Senate side?

Why do we get threats of vetoes from the White House when we find agreement?

We would find agreement on almost the entire CR if we got that one provision there, where even some of the Senators themselves, and now we are seeing it in the press where, I think you mentioned Wolf Blitzer has now joined with Senator MANCHIN as well as Sen-

ator BAUCUS in thinking the Obama health care take over is a train wreck, that we are seeing a pretty diverse group of people saying, you know, a 1-year delay would not be an unreasonable thing.

As we have seen the exchanges rolling out, they are not working very well. And people, when they are looking finally to find out what the prices are, what it is going to cost them, maybe people thought they were going to get it for free. They were going to get a rebate; they were going to get a lower price. A lot of Americans, especially the youth, are going to see higher prices. They are not going to see the savings.

And if you look at the track record of the government operating things, government generally doesn't do things cheaper, and we are going to learn this in a very detrimental way to our economy, to the health care for the people of this country as this Obama health care takeover continues to roll out.

Mr. GOHMERT. And I am sure that Mr. LAMALFA has had people ask, as I have had, now, why in the world is ObamaCare costing so dramatically much more than the health insurance we had before?

And then we get notified we are actually getting less health care.

And my friend mentioned Wolf Blitzer, this article in National Review online quoted him as saying if they weren't fully ready, talking about the Web sites, ObamaCare Web sites, they should accept the advice that a lot of Republicans are giving them, delay it another year, get it ready, make sure it works.

They know how to do it; but if they didn't get it ready on time, then maybe fix the problem and make sure people don't have to worry about it.

But we come back, it is a disaster. It is more expensive than people's health care was before. They are getting less health care; they are not keeping their doctor. And most—it sounds like an awful lot of Americans are not keeping the policy they have. So why is it costing so much more?

And what people that don't know need to understand, when you hire thousands and thousands of people who don't provide health care to be navigators through the health care system, and you hire 18,000-or-so more IRS officers to go through every detail of people's personal financial and personal life, and they don't provide any health care, they may cause some health problems, but they don't provide any health care—you add all this bureaucracy—it is going to cost more and you are going to get less treatment, and it is not going to be as good a treatment.

I yield back to Mr. LAMALFA.

Mr. LAMALFA. Exactly. Now, who are the navigators?

Weren't they supposed to be vetted as to who they are, go through security?

And as well, look at the track record of the IRS. Do the American people really want 18,000 or so IRS individuals

helping with their important personal health data?

I mean, there have been laws passed to make sure that that is a very secure thing. Sometimes even inconvenient to the patient, where you might be at the doctor and say, well, don't you already have this information from my other doctor?

There are very strict guidelines in how your information is traded around. Now it is going to be in the hands of navigators that are unvetted and with IRS agents that have some very huge security issues already with the way that is being used against certain organizations.

Mr. GOHMERT. And there is a story today from the Daily Caller about the White House IRS exchanged confidential taxpayer information by Patrick Howley. So if you think your personal information is secure with the IRS, or with the Federal Government, it is already showing you should not be comfortable with it happening.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. LAMALFA. The most outrageous thing for most folks, though, is that the waivers, many individuals in this country are asked for and got to be outside of this as it was coming together; and more and more are asking for it, some are being turned down.

But especially, I guess, buying off Members of Congress through the OPM, allowing Congress and Capitol Hill to be exempt from this. If it is such a great program, if it is going to work so well, why would we be subject to a waiver?

Why are they talking about there would be a brain drain on Capitol Hill because everybody would be leaving because they can't afford the health insurance?

How does that work?

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, apparently, our time is expiring. I appreciate so much my friend, Mr. LAMALFA, helping me. And we should not be treated any differently. The President and his family need to sign up.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth noting that when I went out to the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial, the Iwo Jima Memorial, this administration had tried to prevent World War II veterans from getting to the symbol of Mount Suribachi, and there were three busloads of World War II vets up there at the memorial, and the barricade was in pieces.

God bless our World War II veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 10, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3261. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0209; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-127-AD; Amendment 39-17514; AD 2013-14-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3262. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BRP-Powertrain GmbH & Co KG Rotax Reciprocating Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0263; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-12-AD; Amendment 39-17535; AD 2013-15-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3263. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0197; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-09-AD; Amendment 39-17524; AD 2013-15-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3264. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1285; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-073-AD; Amendment 39-17544; AD 2013-16-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3265. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1033; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-266-AD; Amendment 39-17504; AD 2013-13-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3266. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0669; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-117-AD; Amendment 39-17540; AD 2013-16-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3267. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0447; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-17-AD; Amendment 39-17536; AD 2013-15-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3268. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace LP (Type Certificate Previously Held by Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0093; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-109-AD; Amendment 39-17515; AD 2013-14-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received

September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3269. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1156; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-205-AD; Amendment 39-17500; AD 2013-13-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3270. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0564; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-013-AD; Amendment 39-17494; AD 2013-13-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LONG, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. LATTI, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RADEL, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HALL, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 3279. A bill to amend section 1303(b)(3) of Public Law 111-148 concerning the notice requirements regarding the extent of health plan coverage of abortion and abortion premium surcharges; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLEMING (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3280. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to limit the application of such Act to certain imported plants and finished plant products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3281. A bill to transfer criminal enforcement and investigative authority and functions of certain agencies to the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.J. Res. 92. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Centers for

Disease Control and Prevention for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY
STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill is based is Congress's power under the Commerce Clause in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 3280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which states "The Congress shall have Power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.J. Res. 92.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 25: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 262: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 455: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 460: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 565: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 666: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 669: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 685: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 719: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 732: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 794: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 831: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 855: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 961: Mr. COSTA and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

- H.R. 964: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 997: Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 1100: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 1150: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 1226: Mr. MARINO.
 H.R. 1276: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 1339: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 1385: Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 1389: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1428: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 1429: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
 H.R. 1507: Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 1690: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 1705: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 1907: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 1921: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 1992: Mr. COOK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. VARGAS.
 H.R. 1998: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 2016: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND.
 H.R. 2023: Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 2027: Mr. LANKFORD.
 H.R. 2296: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 2330: Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 2502: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H.R. 2509: Mr. MORAN.
 H.R. 2542: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 2560: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2575: Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 2654: Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 2738: Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 2780: Mr. HIMES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2794: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 2839: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2902: Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 3040: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 3080: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H.R. 3118: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 3163: Ms. BASS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 3178: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. GALLEGO.
 H.R. 3183: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 3188: Mr. AMODEI.
 H.R. 3212: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 3232: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. MCCAUL.
 H.R. 3274: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 3275: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. WILLIAMS.
 H.J. Res. 64: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. JONES.
 H.J. Res. 91: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TURNER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H. Res. 30: Mr. COSTA.
 H. Res. 208: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H. Res. 247: Mr. KEATING.
 H. Res. 254: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H. Res. 353: Mr. DELANEY.
 H. Res. 360: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H. Res. 365: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. QUIGLEY.